COUNTWAY LIBRARY
HC 18HR $

SECOND SERIES OF "LYRA GERMANICA."

Now ready, in fcp. 8vo. price 5s. cloth,

LYRA GERMANICA.

Second Series: The Christian Life.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY

CATHERINE WINKWORTH.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

AIDS *of the* CHURCH.

Holy Seasons:—
Advent.
Christmas.
Epiphany.
Passion Week.
Easter.
Ascension.
Whitsuntide.
Trinity.

Services:—Morning and Evening Prayer; Baptism; Holy Communion; For Travellers; At the Burial of the Dead.

PART II. *The* INNER LIFE.

Penitence. Praise and Thanksgiving.
The Life of Faith. Songs of the Cross.
The Final Conflict and Heaven.

CRITICAL OPINIONS *of the* SECOND SERIES.

"MISS WINKWORTH deserves the thanks of every lover of sacred verse for her rendering into English of these admirable compositions."

CHRISTIAN TIMES.

"THIS is a very valuable addition to the former selection from the rich German hymnology, and will earn for the translator the gratitude of many readers. It admits more variety than the former series, which was adapted to the Sundays and to some of the festivals of the Church year; it supplies the omission in that volume of hymns commemorative of the Sacraments, and it gives the words of consolation and support for the various emergencies of the Christian's course, for life and death, and all their modifications of sickness, affliction, and bereavement; as well as for that inner life which is between man and his Creator and Redeemer. The hymns exhibit similar fervour and practical excellence to the former selection, and we are glad to receive the promise of an edition accompanied by appropriate old German chorales, arranged for the choir and family, as they are sung by vast congregations in their native land."

GLOBE.

"IN England we have no collection of hymns to compare with these two volumes. We hope that our future hymn-writers will follow the example of these old devout Germans, whose religion pervades the whole life, their week-days as well as their Sundays, their casual meetings in the street, their gaieties even as well as their meetings in the church. Let the sacred poet deal with every phase of religious emotion—with the lights and shades of a Christian's life, not forgetting the thankful feelings that rise within him when he beholds his children engaged in their sunset games; when he looks round him on a well-ordered home, sweetened by a wife's smile; when he walks on the bare moor, the furze golden around him; and when he sees in the windless autumn afternoon the fields whitening to the harvest. The hymn-writer ought to familiarise us with religion, to make us feel that it is not confined to the services of the Sanctuary, but associated with the quiet procession of ordinary things—the mother among her children, the husbandmen following the plough, or scattering the seed in the furrow; that it has something to do with the desk of the merchant, and with the tools of the craftsman." ECLECTIC REVIEW.

By the same Translator, *Fifth Edition*,

LYRA GERMANICA, FIRST SERIES, Hymns for the Sundays and chief Festivals of the Christian Year ..... Fcp. 8vo. 5*s*.

☞ *The above works form a Companion to*

THEOLOGIA GERMANICA, translated by SUSANNA WINKWORTH: With Preface by the Rev. C. KINGSLEY, and Prefatory Letter by the Chevalier BUNSEN. *Third Edition* ..... Fcp. 8vo. 5*s*.

London: LONGMAN, BROWN, and CO., Paternoster Row.

VERACITY

OF

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

BOSTON MEDICAL LIBRARY
IN THE
FRANCIS A. COUNTWAY
LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

THE

VERACITY OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS

WITH THE

LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE INSPIRED HISTORIAN

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM H. HOARE, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND AUTHOR OF "LETTERS TO THE RIGHT HON. SIR GEORGE GREY, BART. ON MR. FOX'S SCHEME OF EDUCATION," "OUTLINES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY," ETC. ETC.

LONDON

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, AND ROBERTS

1860

The right of translation is reserved

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/veracityofbookof0000revw

PREFACE.

The Scriptures of the Old Testament have long been the favourite ground of attack with the opponents of revelation. Those who would engage in its defence must therefore necessarily occupy the same ground, and not too securely reckon on the safety of the citadel while they suffer the outposts to be taken with indifference. It has indeed been maintained, that a pure and spiritual religion can have nothing to do with remnants of Judaism, nor the faith of Christ need any support from preceding and less perfect dispensations. Nay, with some even orthodox writers the disposition has been manifested to disclaim for the Christian faith in its essential characteristics any necessary dependence on the former covenant, and to assert for it a sufficiency of evidence within its own immediate and peculiar sphere. The prophecies themselves, whose remarkable fulfilment has ever been accounted one

great leading evidence for the truth of our holy religion, existed, these writers remind us, not in the sacred volume alone, but currently among the whole Jewish people, and partially also amongst the Gentile nations of the world. "I do not see," says a late learned writer of our own Church, "how it would injure any part of the argument on which our belief of Christianity is properly founded, if the historical books of the Old Testament had not been handed down to us at all. It is the adversary of Christianity who commonly appeals to the Old Testament, that being the side on which he deems the proof of revelation to be weakest." And he endorses the saying of Paley, that "We ought not to make Christianity answer with its life for every fact recorded in the Old Testament."[1]

At the same time, it may appear to many minds impossible practically to separate either the prophetic from the historical parts, or the entire books of the Old Testament from those of the New. So long as they are bound up in one volume, and that volume is in every one's hands in its present form, it is difficult to see how any other impression can be popularly entertained, but such as shall associate the two Testaments in necessary connection, so that whatever shakes the credit of the one must in

[1] Dean Lyall, *Preparation of Prophecy*, ch. viii. Rivington, 1854.

some measure weaken the authority of the other. There is, besides, in the history of the Old Testament such a variety of topics, and so large a collection of facts, coming in contact at every turn with the common events of history, and therefore obviously challenging comparison with those events, and leading to a variety of criticism from every quarter; that to shun that criticism, and hide our eyes from the light of any fresh discoveries, would imply either unpardonable indolence, or a defective appreciation of the strength of those arguments on which the inspiration of the Scripture rests. When we think of the great strides which science is every day making, the many discoveries of modern travel and research, to say nothing of the advantage accruing from the possession and collation of so many new manuscripts and ancient versions of the Scriptures, it is among the first duties of the Christian philosopher to bring his faith to the test of these discoveries, and to seek a fair adjustment of any differences which in the course of argument and the conflict of opinion may chance to arise. It has often proved—and who can tell how often it may prove again?—that persevering industry and advancing science have been of excellent use in clearing up Scripture difficulties, and bringing out the meaning of disputed passages. The readers of

Butler will remember a passage in his "Analogy" which greatly encourages this hope, where he says, "If ever the whole scheme of Scripture comes to be understood before the *restitution of all things*, and without miraculous interpositions, it must be in the same way as natural knowledge is come at: by the continuance and progress of learning and of liberty, and by particular persons attending to, comparing and pursuing, intimations scattered up and down it, which are overlooked and disregarded by the generality of the world. . . . . Nor is it at all incredible that a book, which has been so long in the possession of mankind, should contain many truths as yet undiscovered. For, all the same phenomena, and the same faculties of investigation, from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made in the present and last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before. And possibly it might be intended that events, as they come to pass, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture."[1] So far then from being surprised at any new endeavour to throw light on the page of Scripture,—so far from shunning comparison with any new sources of information,—such inquiries should be rather en-

[1] Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion, part. ii. chap. iii.

tertained with ardour, and hailed as efficient helps to a better understanding of the sacred text.

It is at the same time to be lamented, that in the excess of critical zeal some have ventured rashly to compromise essential truths of the Christian faith, and professing by some new lights to explain the Scripture, have virtually explained it away. Some, for instance, have run into the absurdity of denying all miracles, and openly rejecting whatever in Divine revelation cannot be brought under the denomination and order of natural events. They judge of everything by a spurious idea of reason; *i.e.* they measure it by their own notions of what ought to be, —by what, they think, accords with "general laws of nature," with the early "traditions of nations," or with the "religious consciousness of the individual." The earlier Rationalist came forward, it is true, in defence, as he thought, of Christianity, and not in opposition to it. It was upon the publication of "one of the most formidable attacks," as Professor Powell well calls it[1], "which the cause of Christianity had ever sustained, under the name of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, ascribed to *Lessing* (1773—1778)," that *Paulus*, *Eichhorn*, and other learned men of the Rationalistic school, took up

[1] Order of Nature, Essay iii. § 2.

this new ground on the side, as they believed, of the true faith. But as they too easily joined the adversary in the denial of whatever is supernatural or miraculous, it is easy to understand,—what in fact actually happened,—that they formed but a stepping-stone for others, who, with bolder hand and greater consistency, proceeded to deny, not the miraculous parts alone, but all the chief and distinctive doctrines of Scripture — the Incarnation, for example, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and most other articles of the Creed, and this for no better reason than because of the miraculous nature of these objects of belief, and the mere fact of their transcending the limits of human knowledge and experience. What is this, but under the name of Christianity to revive the worst errors of the avowed sceptic of the days of Hume and Voltaire? and with the best intentions, perhaps, of promoting the cause of truth, to make a large and fatal concession to its worst enemies?[1] It is easy to speak of the "natural" interpretations, or of the "ra-

[1] We speak especially of *Strauss* and his followers, the "Lichtfreunde," or "Friends of Light," as they are apt to call themselves in Germany. Not that in England we can boast ourselves free from the infection; nor can we well reckon how far and how deep it may be spreading amongst us. It is also a fact to which we should not shut our eyes, that these opinions sprung originally from our own country in the last century, and they are now returning to us with interest. Froude's *Nemesis of Faith;* F. J. Foxton's *Popular*

tional," or of the "mythical;" but as an American writer has well observed, "The natural interpretation by its unnaturalness, and the mythical by its absurdity in some instances, and by its daring im-

Christianity; Theodore Parker's *Theism, Atheism, and the Popular Theology,* will supply some choice specimens. The latter writes in the following strain:—"I do not believe that there ever was a miracle, or ever will be: every where I find law,—the constant mode of operation of the Infinite God. I do not believe in the miraculous inspiration of the Old Testament or the New Testament. I do not believe that the Old Testament was God's first word, nor the New Testament His last. The Scriptures are no finality to me. Inspiration is a perpetual fact. Prophets and apostles did not monopolise the Father. He inspires men to-day as much as heretofore. I do not believe in the miraculous origin of the Hebrew Church, or the Buddhist Church, or the Christian Church, nor the miraculous character of Jesus. I take not the Bible for my master, nor yet the Church, nor even Jesus of Nazareth for my master. . . . I try all things by the human faculties." —*Theism, &c.*, pp. 263, 264. A particular account of the infidel writers of the last century, as well as of the principal works in answer to them, will be found in Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures* for the years 1802 to 1805. See also a more recent account carried down to the present time in the late Archdeacon Hardwick's *Christ and other Masters* (particularly vol. i. pp. 1—40; *On the Religious Tendencies of the present Age*); an able review of Strauss's, *Leben Jesu,* in appendix to one of the essays in the collection of articles from the *Edinburgh Review* by Mr. Rogers, entitled *Reason and Faith;* Professor Powell, *Order of Nature,* Essay iii., *On the Rationalistic and other Theories of Miracles.* See again, on the derivation of some modern objections across the Channel from English sources of the last century (as painfully exemplified in some of the abovenamed works), some important hints, from which we select the following:—"The objections in question are not the novelties they affect to be. It is necessary to remember this, in order to obviate an advantage which the very vagueness of much modern opposition to Christianity would obtain from the notion that some prodigious arguments have been discovered, which the intellect of a Pascal or a Butler was not comprehensive enough to anticipate, and which no Clarke or Paley would have been logician enough to refute. We affirm, without hesitation, that when the new advocates of

piety in others, both combine to drive us back to the *supernatural.* On that ground, and on that only, all becomes plain, consistent, and intelligible. By the other plan you may, indeed, get rid of all chronological difficulties, and of troublesome discrepancies; but you are compelled to deny the genuineness of the books, and you destroy their authority. Thus *Wegscheider* declares it impossible to rescue the Bible from the reproaches and scoffs of its enemies, except by the acknowledgment of *mythi* in the sacred writings, and the separation of their inherent meaning from their unhistoric form? *De Wette*, denying the possibility of miracle and of prophecy, maintains the modern origin of the Pentateuch, and especially of the book of Genesis. *Strauss* lays it down for an infallible criterion of myth, when a narrative is intermingled with accounts of phenomena or events of which it is either expressly stated or implied that they were produced immediately by God Himself (such as Divine apparitions, voices from heaven, and the like), or by

infidelity descend from their airy elevations, and state their objections in intelligible terms, they are found, for the most part, what we have represented them. . . . . Hardly an instance of discrepancy is mentioned in the 'Wolfenbüttel Fragments' which will not be found in the pages of our own deists a century ago; and, as already hinted, the vast majority of Dr. Strauss's elaborate strictures will be found in the same sources." —Rogers, *Reason and Faith,* p. 238.

human beings possessed of supernatural powers (miracles, prophecies, &c.). In short, that "a miracle is impossible, prophecy is impossible, and *therefore* all accounts detailing miracles are not true; they are but fables; such fables are the growth of long time in rude ages, *therefore* the Pentateuch must have been a collection of traditions put together many ages after the occurrence of the wonderful events which they so exaggerate; consequently, the Pentateuch cannot be the work of Moses. Moreover, the Gospel histories also being full of marvels, could not have been the production of eyewitnesses, as is vulgarly believed."[1] Such are the bold assertions which these writers have ventured to build upon the one gratuitous assumption, That a "miraculous narrative necessarily involves some mythical origin;" and that "mysteries must give way to reason"—to reason, that is, in *their* sense of the word, viz. the limited comprehension of man's finite and imperfect understanding.

In Germany, we have reason to be thankful that a purer light seems of late years to be dawning upon the spirit of the popular Theology. A new class of writers has arisen, uniting the "illumination" and deep research of their predecessors, with a

[1] Hamilton on the Pentateuch, 1852.

more profound and just reverence for the inspired records. The highly esteemed names of *Neander*, *Olshausen*, *Tholuck*, *Kurtz*, *Rohr*, *Böck*, *Hävernick*, *Stier*, *&c.*, are the harbingers of better times and a more hopeful theology. Let England but aspire to rival at once the learning, the patient spirit, and the mutual kindly feeling of her neighbours across the channel; and she too may hope to contend successfully against the new forms of error; and to restore the Scriptures to their just place in the estimation of all sincere seekers after truth. Nor need we, in the meantime, be deaf to the voice of history, or the testimonies of experience; we need show no disrespect to the rational conclusions of philosophical investigation, nor lag timidly behind the advancing march of the literature and science of the day. Reason may assuredly find sufficient scope for its exercise, without rudely seeking to displace Revelation; and there is abundance in the Scriptures alone to employ the intellect without violating those mysterious doctrines of the Faith, which reason itself might fairly have anticipated in a Revelation professedly coming from the Infinite source of Wisdom and Truth.

We can think of no better way to assist in counteracting any new attempt to revive the Scepticism of a past age, than by building up what the sceptic

would destroy, — by endeavouring at least to show the futility of many objections popularly but inconsiderately entertained against the plain sense of Scripture ; and that the Mosaic record, which stands at the fountain-head of Revelation, contains nothing but what agrees well both with the reason and experience of mankind. And this design appears to comprehend the two-fold task,—

First,—Of representing plainly and correctly what is really the substance (divested, perhaps, of some mistaken associations) of the earlier portion of Genesis: and,

Secondly,—Of proving that there is nothing in it at variance either with reason (in the proper acceptation of the term), as founded on the true relation of things, or with matters of fact, as discoverable from other sources.

It will not, however, be necessary in the popular and general view of the question which is here proposed, to separate nicely in every instance between these two divisions of the subject; but rather, as each event or doctrine comes under consideration, to endeavour as far as may be, to substantiate the credibility of the one, or to show the reasonableness of the other. This task will lead naturally to many interesting particulars of the Life of Moses, which may serve, perhaps, as a

general guide and introduction to the study of the Pentateuch;—and thence to the earliest records of profane history, and especially to the condition of Egypt at the time of Exodus. This will be followed by a careful collation of the best accounts concerning the Dispersion and first settlement of Nations, together with something of their subsequent history. The way will then be prepared for a more attentive study, in the next place, of the clear evidences, which will be pointed out, that in the still more remote records of Creation itself, Moses wrote under no ordinary illumination, but that the account in Genesis will stand the test of even the most recent discoveries of modern times. There will be added, in conclusion, a general summary of the whole; and the bearing of those earlier records on the principles and final establishment of Christianity will be carefully traced. Should the minds of any, into whose hands his work may fall, have been unsettled (as, doubtless, many are) by the fluctuating opinions of the day,—to such the Author trusts he may be performing no unacceptable service, when he offers them this opportunity of confirming themselves in the certainty of a few leading principles, which, taking their rise in the earlier records of Moses, will be found to run, like sacred threads, through the whole texture of Reve-

lation. The works of Moses are indeed a mine of wealth, from which something valuable might be gathered by readers of every country and every age, of every rank and every profession. To exhaust its riches would be a work far beyond the pretensions of the writer; and would far exceed the limits of his present undertaking. He can but hope to have worked successfully some few veins which seemed to promise the best reward to his labours, and to present the most striking and salient points, for displaying the high character of the original, and its intimate and important relation to all succeeding periods in the history of mankind.

In treating the "Life and Character of Moses" himself, before his history of the world and its creation, it may be expedient to notice, as the reason for thus appearing to invert the scriptural order of subjects, that it seemed the order more agreeable to general usage, and likely to be conducive to the better understanding of the whole. Indeed the works of any Author are considered almost incomplete without his life; for the obvious reason that they mostly admit of important illustration from a previous acquaintance with the times in which he lived, and the circumstances under which he wrote.

A few words may suffice on the Geological relations of Genesis, as about to come under consideration in the course of the subject. It will be our endeavour, without pretending to any special originality of view in this department, to gather from different quarters a just idea of the present state of conflicting opinions as to the leading difficulties in this department; and particularly as to the purport and duration of the Mosaic "days of creation." Whether the account in Genesis was properly intended to embrace the whole structure of the earth during the long periods of the deposition of the successive geological strata, — or whether the "days" are natural days, and we have only the literal account of a "six days'" preparation of the earth for the immediate habitation of man,—is perhaps the point, on which the chief interest is concentrated. In whichever way, however, this question may be determined, the believer in Revelation need scarcely fear for the result. Upon the *former* supposition, we have a simple coincidence and identity between the account in Genesis, and the observations of Nature — one evidently confirming the other. Upon the *latter* there is no collision, and therefore no contradiction;—since the periods must be supposed different, to which the two records, the scriptural and

the natural, principally refer. It may be added, that in the opinion of many, the same "law of creation" (as it has been termed) is observable on either view. There is the same ascending scale from the lower to the higher types of life — exemplified, upon the one hypothesis, on the smaller scale of "six" natural "days;" — extending, upon the other, through all antecedent periods and all successive phases of the world's existence. Thus, whether we adopt the literal or the unliteral interpretation of the days, we may equally join in the persuasion that "there is now no ground for apprehension, that there will be any displacement of the established law of creation," whereby there has been "a gradual progress from the lower to the higher orders of living organisms—from the simply constructed Zoophyte, through the intermediate classes of the invertebrate Molluscs, Crustaceans, vertebrate Fishes, Reptiles, and Mammals, up to Man."[1] Nor is this the only remarkable coincidence between the two versions of the Scripture narrative. They are both of them greatly in advance of the old and now obselete theory, which in the mystic "beginning" saw only a brief preamble to the work of the six days following; — in the deso-

[1] Quoted from M'Causland, *Sermons in Stones*, Ed. 4.

lation and "darkness," a primitive "chaos" of confused elements;—in the "light" which followed, the first creation of that element; in the "sun, moon, and stars" of the "fourth day," the similar origination of all the celestial bodies; and so forth. It is a satisfactory instance of the mutual reaction of revelation and science, that our knowledge of Cosmogony has long since outstripped these raw beginnings; and the great question now in discussion among geologists is one, which, in either way of deciding it, can only end in reflecting fresh honour on the marvellous accuracy of the Mosaic record.

CONTENTS.

Chap.		Page
I.	Introductory Observations	1
II.	The Life of Moses.—First Part	21
III.	The Life of Moses.—Second Part	58
IV.	The Dispersion	96
V.	Relation of Geology to the Scripture Narrative	130
VI.	The Mosaic Order of Creation	167
VII.	The Mosaic Order of Creation continued	202
VIII.	The Mosaic Order of Creation concluded	243
—	Concluding Observations	263

APPENDIX.

Notice of "*The History of the Old Covenant*," by Dr. Kurtz. Foreign Translation Series. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1859 . . . . . 293—303

Appendix Notes.

Chap. II. On the Contemporary History of Egypt, regarding chiefly (1.) The Time of the Exodus. (2.) The reigning Sovereign, and General Condition of the Country at the Time . . . 41—57

PAGE

CHAP. III. On the Typical Character of Moses . 90—95

CHAP. IV. Dr. Whewell on the Origin of Language . 129

CHAP. V. On the supposed Agencies in the great Physical Disturbances of the Earth's Surface, at the successive Geological Epochs . . . 163—166

CHAP. VI. On the Contrast between the Biblical and Geological Accounts, as to the Precedence of the Vegetable to the Animal Tribes . . 201

CHAP. VII. (1.) On alleged Human Remains in the older Strata. (2.) On the Divine Image in Man, various Opinions contrasted. (3.) On the Effects of the Fall on the Divine Image in Man, and the Means of its Recovery . . . . 228—242

CHAP. VIII. On the Relation of Genesis to the Subsequent Books of the Pentateuch . . . 283—289

THE VERACITY

OF

THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

CHAPTER I.

Introductory Observations.

If a book were presented to us, professing to contain an account of the first man, the first arts and sciences, the first cities, the first origin of nations, the first houses, the first ships,—to say nothing of the earliest ideas of religion, and the earliest institutions of religious worship, — the very profession of such a theme would secure for it a more than ordinary attention and interest. Now just such a book — to go no deeper into it at present — is the book of Genesis. On the most cursory inspection, it abounds with notices of the very antiquities we have enumerated. Archæologically considered, there is nothing in the

CHAP. I.

whole compass of historical document that bears the marks of such great and venerable antiquity,—nothing that embraces subjects of the same universal interest, the same extensive relation to the world we live in, and to the original and essential elements of society. Some would claim for it a still wider sphere. In its opening portion they would see the formation of primitive rocks,—the first filling of space with the immensity of all created matter, with the stars in their several spheres, with ethereal and liquid forms, before they were shaped and consolidated into the grosser elements which have since been associated with our ideas of the material world. And to what extent the mysteries of creative power were intended to be evolved in detail in the Mosaic account,—or how far the details given are calculated to bear the test of physical science,—or within what limits the description holds good,—may be regarded as open questions. But of this we are certain,—for of this there is the clearest evidence on the face of the account,—that we have here what professes to be a description of the primitive state of man, and of the world as coeval with man, *i.e.*, as immediately prepared for his habitation. It then goes on with a relation of the times and events immediately subsequent,—events directly bearing on all the interests of society in general, and on the whole history of the world to the present time. And such being the obvious and professed scope and nature of this wonderful

book, an enquiry at once suggests itself, on what grounds of authority it rests, and how far its claims to inspiration deserve to be admitted? In other words, what were the sources from which the author derived his information? and whence did he obtain it? Was it to his superior skill in antiquarian research? to extraordinary erudition, and great advantages of education? or was it rather to still higher endowments, to preternatural aid, and to direct light from Heaven, that we may ascribe these marvellous revelations?[1] Genesis being the first book in Holy Scripture, adds greatly to the importance of this enquiry. It is there that our earliest ideas are formed of the Divine administration and government of the world; it is there we find the key to the imagery and phraseology of all other scripture; there that its chief allusions find their explanation; and, if we take in the whole Pentateuch, we may say, it is there only we must look for all the principal ideas and historic facts

[1] "There is no work whose loss would cause a wider chasm in our historical knowledge than the first five books of the Old Testament. But for them, we should be without so much as even a tradition respecting the early history of mankind. Of the value of this book as a mere literary document, it may be sufficient to observe, that the language in which it is written had ceased to be a spoken language before any other history now extant was composed; and that the facts which it records are exactly those about which our curiosity would be most alive, supposing we had no information concerning our primeval ancestors beyond what has been preserved in the broken and, for the most part, fabulous traditions which we find in the ancient poets of Greece."—Lyall's *Preparation of Prophecy*, Part I. ch. viii.

CHAP. I.

which form the basis, the great vocabulary, as it were, of the entire volume of inspiration.

In assisting, as we hope to do, in this important enquiry,—an enquiry so much the more pressed upon our attention of late years by the doubtful tone into which even some eminent theologians have fallen on the subject,—we may state, at the outset, that the class of evidence to which we shall have occasion to appeal is that which arises from the nature of the contents themselves of the books of Moses, and particularly of the earlier chapters of Genesis. For of all the proofs that may be alleged in favour of their Divine inspiration, none has appeared to us more interesting or more conclusive than the kind of evidence of which we speak. Foremost, we would place the whole life and character of the great Lawgiver himself, whose exploits follow in the subsequent portions of the Pentateuch. And assuming, according to the uniform tradition of the Jews, that the giving of the law and all those exploits, and the writing of the Books, were by the same hand, we find in the very nature of the transactions presumptive evidence of no mean degree, that the author was, in his writings also, acting under the immediate sanction and assistance of Heaven. The fact is, we do not ordinarily take our measure of the authority of Genesis from the earlier chapters of it, nor from any particular subjects in them, but from the general tenor of those subsequent portions of

the Pentateuch which contain the actual history of the writer (for so we take leave to call him[1]) and of the marvellous people whose appointed leader and prophet he was. It is to this history that the earlier chapters lead up and are introductory. It would seem, therefore, unreasonable to dwell much on the details of the latter till we have furnished ourselves, in the first instance, with the necessary information derivable from the former. Our value for the writings insensibly depends on our estimate of the writer. And though the highest opinion which, upon a diligent study of that history of Moses, we might conceive of the wisdom, the ability, and the integrity of his conduct and character, would not exactly justify us in concluding him to have been the subject of immediate and actual inspiration, yet could we not deny to those qualities, when fairly made out, that due weight which is ever accorded to them by the universal sentiments of humanity. A certain amount of credit will readily be allowed for such qualifications, appearing in whomsoever they may. They naturally pave the way for a more attentive hearing of those other and higher claims which, though resting on distinct grounds, seem thus recommended, as it were, to our more patient and impartial consideration. It may not, therefore, be an unprofitable

[1] The learned *Eichhorn,* with the earlier Rationalists, admitted the genuineness, *i.e.,* the Mosaic origin, of the Pentateuch. The same was admitted by Porphyry and others. See Note, p. 13.

CHAP. I.

labour to commence our notice of the earlier chapters in Genesis by a detailed review of the Life of Moses. It will at least serve to put the reader on the same starting-ground as ourselves, when we thus invite him to a more intimate acquaintance with the life and character of him on whose credit the documents in question are required to be received.

We must be prepared in such a biography to meet with many incidents differing by their preternatural character from ordinary history; and we must be prepared no less for the common taunt of the objector, ever ready to assail such pretensions, when he perpetually harps upon the never-failing maxim, that "No amount of evidence can prove a miracle!" or, as Voltaire put it, "No such things have happened in our time, therefore, they never happened!" This oft-repeated, and now somewhat trite assertion, may sound plausible to the ear; but there is really very little to recommend it to the reason. If a document introduced into the world and preserved and handed down in so extraordinary a manner, and under such remarkable circumstances, as the Old Testament Scriptures have been, should itself contain nothing extraordinary, this would be far more unaccountable than if, as it does, it should contain accounts and narratives of a character peculiar to itself, and largely abounding with the supernatural and the marvellous. Its preservation alone would be a miracle, if there were no other. The Jewish

people have preserved these records from the beginning with the most jealous care; and this notwithstanding they contain disclosures by no means[1] flattering to their national pride, together with rules of living, and a number of burdensome rites and ceremonies, which no man on his mere private authority, or in the apparent interest of his countrymen or himself, would ever have thought of inventing. These documents, nevertheless, have been handed down by that very people whom they most concern, with the greatest care. They are the very opposite to what we should have expected,

[1] "The most decisive character of truth in any history is its IMPARTIALITY; and here the author of the Pentateuch is distinguished perhaps above every historian in the world. . . . He speaks of the Jewish nation, not only impartially, but even severely; he does not conceal the weakness and obscurity of their first origin—that 'a Syrian ready to perish was their father' (Deut. xxvi. 5); nor their long and degrading slavery in Egypt; their frequent murmurings and criminal distrust of God, notwithstanding his many interpositions in their favour; their criminal apostacy, rebellion, and resolution to return to Egypt—first, when they erected the golden calf at Mount Sinai, and next, on the return of the spies from the land of Canaan: he repeatedly reproaches the people with these crimes, and loads them with the epithets of 'stiffnecked,' 'rebellious,' and 'idolatrous' (Deut. ix.; Exod. xxxii.); he declares to them his conviction, that in their prosperity they would again relapse into their rebellions and idolatries, and imitate the foul vices of those nations whom God had driven out from before them for these very crimes. . . . . So, again, in speaking of his own relatives, and of himself. . . . Of his own family we are told nothing, but that his father-in-law, Jethro, was a wise man, who suggested to Moses some regulations of utility; that his wife was an Æthiopian woman, and as such the object of contempt and opposition even to his own brother and sister (Num. xii. 1). . . How different is all this from the embellishments of fiction or the exaggerations of vanity! How strongly does it carry with it the appearance of humility and truth!"—Graves, *On the Pentateuch*, Part I., Lect. ii.

CHAP I.

both in the character which they give of the people and in the picture which they draw of their prospects, and of the ultimate destination of their kingdom and city. Their boasted Lawgiver faithfully pourtrays to them the certainty of their downfal, should they continue in apostacy from the true God and from the Prophet that was to come. Not like an impostor, who would have concealed their foibles, and lightly excused their faults, we find him, in all his writings and addresses to them, faithfully recording what they had done amiss, and boldly representing the dark side of their character and prospects. Yet these are the very writings which they have so jealously preserved and handed down to posterity. And if, after all this, it should turn out that the contents of the sacred books, in an historical point of view, were nothing but the commonplace narration of ordinary events, the wonder would indeed be on this, rather than on the actual side of the question. But when we observe that the contents of the books are as marvellous as the fact of their preservation and the circumstances of their origin,—that the substance of them consists in a plain and impartial mixture of extraordinary and ordinary dispensations of Providence, and of revelations concerning the past which appear to claim the like authority with the more strictly historical portions,—this agreement and harmony between the style and character of the work and the origin claimed for it, as much

impresses the imagination as convinces the judgment, that the claims are genuine, and that the work is Divine.

It is easy to go upon the tack of denying the possibility of a miracle. We readily grant that the evidence for any alleged miraculous story should be more full and decisive than would be required in a common case; but this is no argument whatever for discarding from the range of our belief the notion of a miracle altogether. To deny the possibility of a miracle is to limit the power of the Creator; it is to banish Him from His own world, which he has made.[1] It is to pronounce, that nothing new, *i.e.*, nothing contrary to what are called "general laws,"[2] can possibly be. And thus

[1] There are, doubtless, *immutable laws* of right and wrong, from which the Deity Himself never departs. These are not so much laws as they are rules of the Divine conduct, essential principles of His nature, and elements of His moral government of the world. But what is to Him a rule *is to His creatures a law;* and a law implies a *lawgiver.* The very use of the terms should remind the objector of that flaw in his argument which would imagine the existence of *law,* and overlook the will and power of the being from whom the law proceeds. With regard to the physical order of nature, the case is perfectly different from that of the moral law by which God governs the world. It will be seen in the next note that even man has power to interfere with the physical laws of the world; how, then, can we deny the same power to the great Being to whom both man himself and the world around him are alike subject and subservient? HE, surely, may interpose at His pleasure; may alter, divert, or suspend the physical laws which He has imposed on His creation.

[2] We come here at once to the doctrine of *Spinoza,* the reviver of Pantheism, as we may call him, in the seventeenth century, and who also made a collection of the principal objections against inspiration, — objections which laid the foundation for the Rationalism of *Le Clerc, Wegscheider,* and succeed-

CHAP. I.

we should be driven, with the *Stoics*, to admit the eternity of matter; with *Lamarck*, the generation

ing writers of that school. He supported in particular the theory of the uniform and undeviating agency of "natural laws," among which he reckoned the ordinary powers of the human mind. "God," he said, "was before all things, and the substance of all, for there was really no other substance in nature besides Him,—so that whatever opposes the laws of nature is *necessarily repugnant to the Divine nature;*—that the powers of nature were no other than the very power of God; and that to ascribe a thing to the Divine power, when we ought to refer everything to a law of nature and a natural cause, is absolute folly. That if we could conceive a phenomenon of any kind to have occurred in the natural world which was in any degree repugnant to nature's law, such a conception was to be rejected as absurd." "Omnia per Dei potentiam facta sunt; immo quia naturæ potentia nulla est nisi ipsa Dei potentia, certum est nos eatenus Dei potentiam non intelligere, quatenus causas naturales ignoramus; adeoque stulte ad eandem Dei potentiam recurritur, quando rei alicujus causam naturalem, hoc est, ipsam Dei potentiam ignoramus."—*Tractatus Theolog. Politicus*, ed. 1674, p. 20. "Si concipere possemus aliquid in naturâ ab aliquâ potentiâ . . . . posse fieri quod naturæ repugnet . . . id ut absurdum rejiciendum." (*Ibid.*, p. 102.) Better this, perhaps, than with the Sadducees and ancient heathen adversaries of Christianity, to ascribe the miracles recorded in Scripture to Beelzebub and evil spirits. Yet in that very charge we find a valuable testimony involved to the truth of the miracles themselves as having really happened,—a testimony so much the more important, as it was near the time when they actually happened. Yet, in the face of an overwhelming amount of testimony, indirect and involuntary as well as direct and actual, the advocates of Christianity are again and again assured that "NO testimony can bring a miracle within the remotest bounds of probability!" and that for the old reason, so much vaunted by Hume and his followers, "that a miracle is contrary to experience." But to *what* experience? For this is surely part of the question in dispute! For the sacred history expressly declares, and neither Jew nor heathen denied it, that miracles *have been* wrought, and that publicly, before many people. They are not then certainly against the *experience* of those who saw them! And a most unreasonable thing it would be to set the *inexperience* of persons who had no opportunity of witnessing such phenomena against the experience of those who had.

But, besides this, it may well

of mankind from an improved race of monkey, and, in short, the whole train of absurdities too often

be doubted whether, speaking *universally*, experience be not rather *for* than against the probability of a miracle. For, granting that it involves a temporary interference with some law of nature, or with the natural order of things, such interference is surely not unfrequent, even within the range of human life and action. Gravitation, for instance, is an order and law of nature; and is it not an "interference" with this law when we lift a weight in our hands and prevent it falling to the ground? Now, if a *man* can lift a weight, cannot God support a drowning man, or cause another to walk on the sea? Cannot He, who has all nature at command, and myriads of angelic agencies to wait upon His will, divide the waves, and make a pathway through the waters? Cannot He fetch the water out of the stony rock? and feed a multitude with manna in the wilderness? It is surprising that among persons boasting of dispassionate reason, the opposite view should ever have found one serious advocate; and that thinking men should not all have come to the conclusion thus eloquently drawn by a learned prelate of our Church, who says, "Convinced that, *by a fair chain of reasoning,*" [*not*, observe, intending it, or clearly seeing such a consequence themselves] "they who deny them must be driven to the necessity of maintaining *Atheistical* principles, by questioning either the power, or wisdom, or goodness of the Creator, the true philosopher will yield to the force of this consideration, as well as to the overpowering evidence of the facts themselves, and will thankfully accept the dispensation which God hath thus graciously vouchsafed to reveal. He will suffer neither wit, nor ridicule, nor sophistry to rob him of this anchor of his faith; but will turn to his Saviour" [for the argument applies to both Testaments alike,] "with the confidence so emphatically expressed by Nicodemus, 'Rabbi, we KNOW that Thou art a teacher come from God; FOR no man can do these miracles that Thou doest, except GOD be with him.'" — Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures*, 1802—1805. Vol. ii. p. 344. We subjoin the opinion of Sir Matthew Hale: — "It is true of miracles as of special Providence, that if we should deny the intervention of special acts of Divine Providence in relation to actions natural or moral that appear in the world, we should exclude His regimen of the world in a great measure, and chain up all things to a fatal necessity of second causes, and allow at most to the glorious God a bare prospect or prescience of things that are or shall be done, without any other regency but merely according to the instituted nature and operations of things."— *Primitive Origination of Mankind*, ch. i.

CHAP. I.

endorsed and passing current with the pretended rationalist, under the name of reason, but which are in reality far more astounding and incredible than anything proposed on the other side. If, on the contrary, we admit a Creator, it is in the highest degree rash and unphilosophical to limit His creating and dispensing power. And though we believe Him to administer the world which He has made, by regular and uniform laws, yet it is impossible for us to decide what acts or events, however seemingly extraordinary, come within the limits of those laws if only we were more perfectly acquainted with them, or how far it may please Him occasionally to depart from them. Thus, for instance, a *revelation*, being clearly a departure from the ordinary course of Providence, is a miracle, and yet we must admit that many such revelations there have been. Among the Jews they were of constant recurrence. Voices from Heaven, or by angelic messengers, in patriarchal times; the Urim and Thummin, under the Law; Visions, under the Prophets, were the constant vehicles and direct instances of such a revelation. They are credibly recorded; they include prophecies long since verified by the result, and thus guaranteeing the reality of the predictive power. Yet to admit this is to admit miracles[1]; and it is therefore nothing against the credibility of the Mosaic

[1] On the argument for miracles, see *Reconcilableness of Reason and Religion*, by the Hon. F. Boyle; J. F. Buddeus, *de Atheismo et*

documents, that miraculous accounts are found among their contents.

We have assumed Moses to be the writer of the Pentateuch[1], and have appealed for the truth of this hypothesis to the invariable tenor of Jewish tradition. That he was so considered among them is evident from the books of the New Testament; and upon other and independent grounds it may not be difficult to prove that he really was. But we may observe, that Moses being the author, is not absolutely essential to the argument for the inspiration of the books, however much it may strengthen that argument. A saying may be none the less true because it is doubtful who said it. The uncertainty of the authorship does not prevent our admiration of many passages in the Letters of Junius. And so in the instance before us; we must keep our eye mainly upon the facts recorded, and not too exclusively on the person recording. It might have been Moses, we will say, for argument's sake, or it might have been some other compiler; but in either case the subject-matter of the record is the

Superstitione; Lettres de quelques Juifs à Mons. de Voltaire, Paris, 1781; Houteville, *La Religion Chrétienne prouvée par les faits;* Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sac.* vol. ii. ch. 5—10; Fleetwood, *Essay on Miracles*; Leslie, *View of Deistical Writers,* vol. i. Letters 18—21; Bryant, *On the Plagues of Egypt;* Rogers, *Reason and Faith.*

[1] We may remark also, that Porphyry, the learned and bitter enemy of Christianity, admitted the authorship of the Pentateuch, and acknowledged that Moses was prior to the Phœnician Sanchoniatho, who flourished before the Trojan war. See Hamilton, *On the Pentateuch,* 1852, p. 137.

CHAP. I.

principal thing. In either view, also, a great interest must attach to the life and character of the chosen leader of Israel out of Egypt, whether he wrote the Pentateuch or not.

That at least the name of that Leader — not to insist more on the authorship of the books — was Moses, we may unhesitatingly assume as a fact equally certain with any in history. Besides in Josephus, and throughout the Scriptures, he is spoken of by *Manetho*, *Diodorus*, *Lysimachus*, *Tacitus*, *Longinus*, and *Strabo*, in short, by nearly all writers, sacred and profane, as the great lawgiver of the Jewish people. The selfsame localities in the East[1] as are mentioned in his own narratives still re-echo his name; and we have the continuous testimony of Jewish tradition to the reality of the man and of his work. But the continuous testimony of the Jewish nation alone amounts to a moral certainty of the fact. It would be impossible for a whole people for ages together to testify to things as actually having taken place among them, and to carry on that testimony from the very time they are said to have occurred, if they never occurred at all. How hopeless it would be for an impostor to go to a strange people,—say to the Siberians,—and persuade them that from time immemorial they, or their forefathers, had been

[1] There are places on the Red Sea called by the natives to this day *Hummam Musa* (bath of Moses), near Tor, and *Ayun Musa* (fountains of Moses), opposite Ras Attaka, or the Bay of Deliverance. See Kitto, *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature.*

circumcised or had kept the Passover, or received the Law on Mount Sinai, or, in short, been the subjects of a history in which they were conscious they had really taken no part! Would any number of Englishmen be persuaded to believe that 600,000 of their ancestors had been led over the Thames at the Nore on dry ground, from the Kentish to the Essex side, if this had never really taken place? But if this would be impracticable with Siberians, or with Englishmen, as unlikely is it that any similar story should have succeeded with the people of Israel, unless it was strictly founded on fact. But when a story did obtain credit, and was received among them from the generation that first witnessed it to their remotest posterity, no doubt can exist in any reasonable mind of the truth and reality of it. In thus stating the case, it will be perceived that we have been following the celebrated argument of *Leslie*[1] in his "Method with the Deists." And if it convincingly shows *the certainty of the facts*, we are sure there must have been *some* principal actor in the transactions thus credibly recorded, even if it was not Moses. To deny that it was Moses is merely, therefore, to shift the question to a dispute about names, and gains absolutely nothing to the side of the objector, except to bring upon him the responsibility of telling us who it was to whom the history belongs. He must equally admit the substance of the history to be true as standing on similar

[1] And see Jenkins' *Reasonableness of Christianity,* vol. i. p. 2. ch. 6.

CHAP. I.

and, we must say, much stronger evidence than it would be easy to find for any other known history in the world.[1]

We have thus briefly stated the case as it regards the substance of the Mosaic history. It may be useful, before concluding these preliminary remarks, to show how the constant persuasion among the chosen people themselves was, that the books of the Pentateuch were to be ascribed to the authorship of the same individual who had conducted their forefathers out of Egypt, as well as in what esteem he was held among the same people as regards the inspiration under which those writings were composed. If others

[1] "Here," says Van Mildert, "as in the Christian Religion, is a series of *facts* easy to be proved or disproved at the time when they were said to be brought, and also several *ordinances* of a peculiar and appropriate description, designed to keep those facts in remembrance. If, then, it be asked, 'Might not an impostor deceive a whole people by pretending to do such things as Moses did? or might not some other impostor afterwards fabricate an account of these pretended transactions? the answer is, that the nature of *facts* clearly refutes the former supposition; and the nature of the *institutions* founded upon them as clearly refutes the latter. For as no man could make a whole people believe that he had laid the country in which they lived under desolation by unheard-of plagues of a preternatural kind, and that he had conducted them for forty years together through a scene of perils, trials, and deliverances unparalleled in the history of mankind, without having actually performed such things; so no man in after times could induce that people to believe that such and such ordinances and memorials of those events had been constantly and religiously observed by that very people ever since the events took place, *if neither such events had ever happened, nor such ordinances and memorials were then really existing.* And it is utterly incredible that at any after period an attempt to impose such things upon the nation, if unfounded in fact, could possibly have succeeded." —Van Mildert, *Boyle Lectures*, ii. 247.

should come to the conclusion that the author of the books was *not* also the chosen leader of the people, they will have *two* characters to account for,—each having distinct claims to inspiration; while, if we take the Jewish tradition and belief, it leaves us the easier task of accounting only for *one*. And this is the hypothesis which, in the following pages, we would be supposed to adopt. The following, then, was the order of the sacred Canon, as received among the Jews: —

The Five Books of Moses .	Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numbers. Deuteronomy.
Four Books of the former Prophets	Joshua. Judges and Ruth. Samuel 1 and 2. Kings 1 and 2.
Four Books of the later Prophets	Isaiah. Jeremiah and Lamentations. Ezekiel. Twelve Lesser Prophets.
Psalms, and rest of the Hagiographa, Nine Books [1] . .	Psalms. Proverbs. Ecclesiastes. Canticles. Job. Daniel. Ezra and Nehemiah. Esther. Chronicles 1 and 2.

[1] *Maimonides,* recognising this division of the ancient Scriptures, and ascribing to Moses the pre-eminence above all the other in-

CHAP. I.

We copy from Bishop Gleig's Introduction to Stackhouse the following observations on the above Canon:—"It is evident, from this classification, that the Jews who made it considered the different classes of their sacred books as entitled to different degrees of reverence; and it is well known that, in the days of our Saviour's sojourning on earth, the five books of Moses were received as canonical scripture by the sect of the Sadducees, and by the people of Samaria. In rejecting the writings of the prophets these heretics did, indeed, greatly err; for these writings have internal evidence, that whatever doctrines or prophecies they contain, were dictated by the Spirit of God, and are therefore unquestionably sacred and authoritative. It cannot, however, be denied that the books of Moses were entitled to peculiar reverence, because they not only contain the complete code of Jewish law and

spired writers, thus enumerates the particulars wherein it consisted, viz.: "(1.) All the other prophets saw the prophecy in a dream or a vision; but our rabbi Moses saw it when he was awake. (2.) To all the other prophets it was revealed through the medium of an angel, and therefore they saw in an allegory or enigma; but to Moses it is said, 'With him I will speak mouth to mouth' (פה אל־פה, Num. xii. 8), and 'face to face' (פנים אל־פנים, Ex. xxxiii. 11). (3.) All the other prophets were terrified; but with Moses it was not so; and this is what the Scripture says,—'As a man speaketh unto his friend' (Ex. xxxiii. 11). (4.) All the other prophets could not prophesy at any time that they wished; but with Moses it was not so, but at any time when he wished for it, the Holy Spirit came upon him; so that it was not necessary for him to prepare his mind, for he was always ready for it, like the ministering angels."—Maimonides, *Yad Hachazakah*, c. vii. See Lee's *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, Appendix C.

religion, but also relate those awful events on which is founded the whole scheme of revealed religion, Christian as well as Jewish."

We have yet higher authority than Jewish tradition. St. Peter sets his seal to the truth of those early Scriptures, where he adopts in his Epistle several principal particulars in the Mosaic records, such as the history of *Balaam* (2 Pet. ii. 15), the destruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, *Lot*, *Noah*, and the *Ark* (2 Pet. ii. 5-7; and 1 Pet. iii. 20). We have his testimony again (2 Pet. iii. 5, 6), that "by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." And he adds (2 Pet. i. 21), "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." St. Paul, in like manner, declares his belief to be grounded on the same Old Testament records—"And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers . . . . I continue witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and *Moses* did say should come" (Acts xxvi. 6, 22). Pleading before Felix, he says (Acts xxiv. 14): "This I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets." "We have found Him,"

CHAP. I.

said a still earlier disciple, "of whom *Moses* in the law, and the Prophets, did write." (John i. 45). To the Jews, who admitted the writings while they rejected the conclusions drawn from them, our Lord himself rejoins (John v. 45, 46), "There is one that accuseth you, even *Moses*, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed *Moses*, ye would have believed Me, for he wrote of Me." On the solemn occasion of one of his latest manifestations of Himself to two of his disciples, "beginning at *Moses*, and all the Prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke xxiv. 27. And in what appears a parting charge to the Eleven Apostles (Luke xxiv. 44), "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of *Moses*, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." With these lights before us, we proceed to follow Moses through the chief events of his personal history. Much additional interest will arise from its connexion with the whole national history of Israel, and much cause of admiration also, as we mark the sober truthfulness of the narrator, and the sublime simplicity of the narrative.

CHAP. II.

The Life of Moses.—First Part.

"The best way of proving the truth of religion is by exhibiting it as it is. The best proof of the creation of the world, of the deluge, and of the miracles of Moses, is the nature of those miracles."—FÉNÉLON.

"So distinctive, so peculiar, that the wonderful vitality of Hebraism in after times can only be explained on the hypothesis that men's devotion to it had been supernaturally produced, and ever since the childhood of the nation had been growing upward with their growth."—HARDWICK.

THE life of Moses is interesting alike to the Statesman, the Lawgiver, the Philosopher, and the Divine. In it we see, reflected as in a mirror, the most favourable image of the times in which he lived—the measure of light enjoyed—and the extent to which it pleased God at that period to manifest His Divine attributes among the most favoured people of the world. We see, moreover, in his personal character, much to venerate and admire—much to qualify him for the work to which he was called; and thus to establish the truth of his Divine mission, and to commend to our approval the titles by which he has come down to us, as "the man of God," and the type of that "Prophet that should come into the world."

It may indeed be difficult to separate him in our

CHAP. II.

view from the system with which we associate his name. We almost unavoidably bring to the consideration of his character the prejudices which cling to our ideas of that more limited dispensation, of which he was the minister. We mix up with our conceptions of the Lawgiver all the imperfections which we associate with the law;—imperfections, be it remembered, which can only be viewed in their true light, when regarded as introductory, in the purposes of Infinite Wisdom, to the better dispensation of the Gospel of Christ. It would be desirable to put aside by some decided effort all such prejudices, if we would form a fair estimate of the man. And if this be done, we doubt not the admirable adaptation of the instrument to the work required, and thereby the wisdom of Divine Providence in selecting him for the office assigned him, will very plainly appear. There will be seen to be nothing strained or unnatural in the fancy of painters and sculptors, when they adorn his brows with horns of light—just emblems, as we shall allow them to be, not merely of the light which beamed from his countenance on his descent from Mount Sinai, but of the peculiar grace which pervaded all the words and actions recorded of him in the daily discharge of the offices of his ministry.

Moses, through his father Amram, was grandson of Levi, and, therefore, fourth in descent from the patriarch Jacob;—thereby illustrating the prophecy in Gen. xv. 16. "And in the fourth generation

they shall come hither again," *i.e.*, out of Egypt into the promised land of Canaan. But though descended from Levi, he was not, technically speaking, a Levite. That office had not yet been instituted, nor that tribe set apart for the public ministry of the tabernacle when Moses was born, nor even when he entered upon the duties of public life. If, therefore, we would picture Moses to our minds, we are not to imagine him in priestly robes, limited to the comparatively small, though venerable sphere of priestly offices. Younger in years than Aaron, he was made Aaron's superior in command; and we have an early example, so to speak, of Church subordinated to State. Yet in Moses there was enough of the Churchman to secure such arrangement from any danger of abuse from reckless and unprincipled invasion of ecclesiastical rule, and from contempt of the laws of religion and morality. He held, in fact, a double office; and when that office became divided with Aaron, one soul as it were animated both; there reigned the strictest harmony between them, not less from ties of brotherhood, than from a common spirit of faith and loyalty to the one true God of Israel.

His infancy fell in a strange land, and in a time of great oppression and cruelty against the people of his race. A Pharaoh had arisen, who "knew not Joseph,"[1] and, desirous of exterminating, or at least of wearing down to insignificant numbers

[1] Ex. i. 8.

CHAP. II.

a people whose industry and good conduct had advanced them to a position of inconvenient wealth and importance in the land of their settlement, had issued an order to slay, or to cast into the river, every male child that should be born to Israel. This order was at first frustrated by the better feelings and brave resistance of the Egyptian midwives. But as regarded the child Moses, it had nearly taken effect, when by God's peculiar blessing on a mother's skill and a sister's tender care and cleverness, he was snatched from a watery grave, and even placed in shelter under Pharaoh's roof. We need scarcely repeat the circumstances; but anything more touching can scarcely be imagined than the pretty artifice of the little Hebrew maid, the sister of Moses, on this occasion. As he was lowered into the river in his slender bark, that "sister stood afar off, to see what would be done to him." The approach of Pharaoh's daughter to perform the rites of ablution in the sacred waters of the Nile, soon gave occasion for the exercise of her watchfulness. At the call of that Princess, who had been attracted by the beauty of the child whom she saw lying on the stream, the little maid rushes forward from her place of concealment, and proffers, as a stranger, her services to procure a nurse. The nurse whom she procures—all unknown to the royal company—is the mother of the child. "The maid went and called the child's mother.[1] . . .

[1] Ex. ii. 4—10.

. . . . And the child grew, and she brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son. And she called his name Moses, and she said, Because I drew him out of the water?" This little 'ark' of bulrushes, we may remark, is called by the same name in Hebrew as the 'ark' which carried Noah and his family in the Flood. It scarcely bore a less precious treasure than that other and more memorable vessel; and the very name was intended, probably, to suggest a parallel between the two events — the one, signalising the preparation for a new world, the other a no less important preparation for a new æra in its development.

Received into the house of Pharaoh, he now grew up a favourite in the King's court. Between the care of a Jewish mother, and the advantages of the royal household, he doubtless acquired the choicest learning of his day. "The magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof"[1] would have waited upon him to instruct him: and, if we give credit to Josephus, he became famous in the arts of war as well as of peace, and headed a military expedition into Ethiopia. Thus he spent the first forty years. And with all these accomplishments, added to the advantages of a goodly person and the prime season of manhood, we can scarcely overestimate the temptations he must have felt to prefer the favours of the court of Egypt, and all

[1] Gen. xli. 8.

CHAP. II.

the blandishments of royal luxury, before the interests of his country, and the sterner calls of duty. It is, however, recorded of him that "he esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt."[1] He determined to "visit his brethren," and to acquaint himself by personal observation with their condition, and the treatment they continued to receive under their "cruel taskmasters."

At this stage of his life, an action is recorded of him, which must have been very trying to his faith. In a contest between an Israelite and an Egyptian, he took part with the Israelite, and "slew the Egyptian."[2] Before he slew him he is recorded to have looked about him, to see that no other Egyptian was near; and afterwards to have "hidden him in the sand."[2] The following day he saw two Israelites engaged in a similar contest, and when he offered again to interfere, one of them reproved him and said, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us? Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian yesterday?"[3] We have purposely given the express words of Scripture in relating this transaction; and we see no ground for calling the first of the actions here related, as some have done, the 'murder' of the Egyptian. There is nothing to prevent our supposing that it was a case of aggravated assault and

[1] Heb. xi. 26. [2] Ex. ii. 12. [3] Ex. ii. 14; Acts vii. 27, 28.

outrage, in the first instance, on the part of the Egyptian, which justified some violence in return, and that therefore Moses was acting on the defensive side. St. Stephen certainly puts this construction upon it, when he says (Acts vii. 24), "Seeing one of them suffer wrong, he *defended* him, and avenged him that was oppressed, and smote the Egyptian." It was an act, therefore, which rather showed his courage, and seemed forced upon him; and though he would hide him from the Egyptians, he clearly wished his own brethren to understand that he felt himself strongly moved to come forward as an avenger of his injured countrymen. He might have reckoned on a general rising of his own people in defence of their rights. Perhaps St. Stephen intimates as much, when he continues, "He supposed that his brethren would have understood him that God by his hand would deliver them, but they understood not." (Acts vii. 25.) On the side of the Egyptians we may regard it as a wholesome warning to them to repent of their oppressions; an intimation that a day of vengeance might await even the monarch upon his throne for his wilful murder of the Israelitish children. To Moses the trial was — not that worst suffering of a troubled conscience (for it was no common impulse under which it had acted), — but the certainty of knowing that by this act there was brought to an issue his resolution to break with Pharaoh. He must

CHAP. II.

not only break with him, he must fly from the city, as amenable to the laws of homicide ; and where then was his hope of doing good to his own people, or of taking the lead in any measures for their benefit? His rejection by his own countrymen was more galling than the wrath of Pharaoh and the awakened suspicions of the Egyptian people. A voluntary and immediate exile was his only resource. With what feelings of mortified ambition! with what disconcerted hopes! with what sad discouragement to his ardent patriotism, must he have fled — an eight days' journey as we read it is — into the wilds of Midian! Here, adopting the garb and occupation of a shepherd, he sat down by a well; and, as it chanced one day, the daughters of some native priest, or chieftain, came to draw water for their herds, and encountered the opposition of a band of marauders, — when Moses took the opportunity to attack the assailants, and by his courage succeeded in driving them away. He was immediately taken into the employ of the father, whose name was Jethro, and whose flocks he tended for another forty years of his life. Can we read this and not forecast his future history? Can we help feeling, that there was upon him, and everywhere following him, the mark and type of the future Deliverer of his people? He was now tending sheep in the wilderness: but there was a larger and more important flock awaiting him; there were oppressions going on, more serious than

the pastoral affrays of Midian; and there was a day of retribution coming, and Jethro's servant the destined instrument. He seemed but a lonely shepherd; yet he was training in the school of adversity, and in the retirement of the desert — in days of labour and nights of watching, to become fitted for his higher charge. In present reward of his fidelity, he obtained, at some later period of his sojourn in Midian, the hand of Jethro's daughter in marriage, — by whom he had two sons, one named Gershom, in remembrance of his father's wanderings, and the other Eliezer. We have no certain evidence, but it is generally supposed that he devoted his hours of leisure to the composition of psalms, particularly of Psalms XC.—C., which are those usually ascribed to Moses. The Book of Genesis might also have employed him, as well as the translation from the Arabic of the Book of Job. The patronymic names of two of Job's friends, Eliphaz and Bildad[1], point clearly to Idumæan, *i.e.*, to Arabian origin. The style and language of the book, as well as the absence of directly Jewish allusions, point equally to an earlier date than the books of the Pentateuch: — and all would be explained, if we suppose the present version of it, as introduced into the Jewish canon, to be a translation by some Jewish author. Tra-

[1] Eliphaz, the *Temanite*, and Bildad, the *Shuite: Teman* being son of Eliphaz, son of Esau, Gen. xxxvi. 10—11; *Shuah*, son of Keturah, wife of Abraham, Gen. xxv. 2.

CHAP. II.

dition gives it to Moses[1]; and there seems every probability that Midian, being contiguous to Idumæa[2], Moses was attracted by this remarkable book which he found there, abounding, as it does, with remarks and incidents full of instruction and consolation in times of affliction and trouble, and that he eventually bequeathed it, in its Hebrew version, to the devout use of posterity.

Thus Moses completed another forty years of his life, when he was destined to receive a more visible appointment to his sacred office. As he was leading his flock near to where the wilderness of Midian sloped away to the heights of Horeb, the Almighty, by the Angel of his presence, suddenly appears to him in a flame of fire in a bush. The bush burns without consuming—apt emblem of the destined preservation of Israel, notwithstanding all the fires of persecution, and the furnace of affliction, through which they must pass. The call is made to Moses, in no ambiguous terms, to become the leader in the great work of their deliverance. The backwardness of Moses to meet the call is now as remarkable as his forwardness on another occasion. But it is no mean symptom of merit, and no bad omen of success, when the first feeling is that of a painful consciousness of personal deficiencies. Forty years' perhaps sorrowful recollection of his

[1] *Kimchi* and the best Rabbinical authorities. See Barry, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* Append. C. 1856.

[2] See again Gen. xxv. 2.

own precipitancy, had quenched somewhat of the early impetuosity of his youth, and taught him a more sober estimate of the difficulties of the charge proposed to him. And if it had ended there,—if, with the cooling down of his ambition, he had lost all the fire of his faith and earnest regard to duty, it would have been a loss to his country, and to the world;—and we should have condemned the excess of prudence with which he debated ere he made his choice. But faith and the strong sense of duty were alive in him still; and the timidity with which he at first shrank from the office proposed to him, gave way before the repeated assurances of the Divine favour and support. He who with his accustomed meekness had imagined himself slow of speech, and of a faltering tongue, was destined to become "mighty in words and in deeds."[1] That highest element of character—ever the parent of the best Christian graces—humility within the heart re-assured by faith in the Divine promises, was seen to work in him in its full measure of power and energy, as was soon to be made manifest in the result.

The scene of the flaming bush is instructive to us upon another account. We see here the terrors, as well as the mercies, of the Divine Majesty. The Almighty reveals himself by the awful name, Jehovah,—so sacred a name among the Jews, that they ever after feared to take it upon their lips.

[1] Acts vii. 22.

CHAP. II.

The giving of this sacred name is accompanied with its explanation. The very thought of a Being self-existent from all eternity—must needs awaken the most profound sentiments of adoration and reverence. Nor are such feelings to be lightly regarded, as though they required not the food of such passages as these;—as if either the conceits of heathen philosophy, or the witchery of heathen superstitions, or even the more genial revelations of a later dispensation, could ever do away with, or in any sense replace them. They are placed deep in the heart by our Maker, and want the nourishment of His own word to feed and develope them. Such would be the effect of the scene before us, if rightly contemplated and improved. "Put[1] off thy shoes from off thy feet; draw not nigh hither, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" was the direct command of the Almighty, even at the moment that He required the attendance and homage of his chosen servant;—a lesson, surely, to all ages of the Church, that men should duly reverence God, even while He graciously condescends to them in the gift of his Son and Holy Spirit. On this, if on any occasion, it might have seemed expedient to divest of its terrors the sacred name of Deity, and to render the approaches to Him easy and familiar. For on it might seem to depend the assurance with which Moses might assume to come into near relationship, as the

[1] Ex. iii. 5.

interpreter of His will, and the privileged recipient of more immediate communications. But none of these considerations, we see, for a moment led to unworthy representations of the Supreme Being. Yet more awful still were to be the future displays of His glory upon Mount Sinai. Assuredly, then, we are not less capable of loving God, when we begin by fearing Him. On the contrary, we are led rather to take heed, that, whether fearing or loving Him, we entertain alike due conceptions of His infinite perfections and attributes. Need we fear that the motives of love to Him will be less because we apprehend Him as the fountain of all perfection, and therefore of all good to man, and of all wisdom and power to sustain His creatures, to protect His people, and to provide for the execution of His own laws? Not even as Christians, then,—not as enjoying all the privileges of the better covenant, and the one all-prevailing Mediator,—not as being invited, in Christ's name, to draw near with filial "boldness to the throne of grace,"[1]—are we entitled to forget that the throne of grace is a throne still, and that it must ever be as petitioners, dependent wholly on the grace and mercy sought, that we draw near.

His instructions are now to go forward to his work. "I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their

[1] Heb. iv. 16.

CHAP. II.

cry by reason of their taskmasters. . . . . Come now, therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt."[1] He is assured that he shall meet Aaron by the way, who shall come out to him from the land of Egypt, and returning with him there lend the weight of his authority and influence (for he was doubtless even then a chief officer in Israel), to secure the respectful hearing of at least his own brethren and countrymen. Aaron was also to relieve him in being spokesman to the people and before Pharaoh. There is a remarkable simplicity in the manner in which the shepherd of Midian takes leave of his master and father-in-law, Jethro. There is no concealing from him the fact of his proposed departure, nor any parade of the distinguished honour that had been put upon him. Neither boasting of his high call, nor attempting to carry it with a high hand, he simply requests leave of absence, and says, "Let me go, I pray thee, and return unto my brethren which are in Egypt, and see whether they be yet alive."[2] His wife and children accompany him, but not far; and then, (as we are led to gather by indirect inference from Scripture[3], and as we find confirmed by Jewish tradition), he commits them to the care of Jethro and proceeds on his way. And thus, bidding adieu to long-cherished ties, and committing wife and

[1] Ex. iii. 7—10. [2] Ex. iv. 18. [3] See Ex. xviii. 5—7.

children to Him who never suffers the righteous to be forsaken, nor his seed to beg their bread[1], he takes the first great step in his appointed mission, —fit type of those who should hereafter be called to "forsake all and follow Christ."[2] As the credentials of their authority, the two fathers of Israel were to be armed with a rod, which being let go should turn to a serpent, and again to its natural form when taken up. Thus armed they arrive in the land of Egypt, and, on the exhibition of their credentials, are received with favour by their own people; but Pharaoh, deluded by the subtlety of his magicians, hardens his heart against them. Again and again they appeal to their Divine commission, and perform wonders in the sight of Pharaoh, which the art of the magicians in vain strives to counterfeit. The Nile is turned to blood —foul creatures pollute the land—diseases break out on man and beast—grievous hail and a profound darkness prevail;—but the monarch's heart is hardened still. It would not have been surprising if the thunderbolts of Heaven had been launched at once against the guilty land; for, besides the obduracy of Pharaoh, the cry of blood was still going up, and the murder of the innocent children was still unavenged. It seems, indeed, that a fitting retribution for that atrocious act of cruelty formed one great part in the counsels of the Almighty at this crisis. He had threatened it at the outset;

[1] Ps. xxxvii. 25. [2] Luke, v. 28.

CHAP. II.

"Israel[1] is my son, even my firstborn: and I say unto thee, let my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him go, I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." But the judgment first threatened was the last fulfilled. It was reserved for the last of the ten plagues to touch the *life* of man; and the stroke now fell upon the firstborn,—"from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sat upon the throne to the firstborn of the captive that was in the dungeon, and all the firstborn of cattle,"[2] and "there was not an house where there was not one dead." Thus, in perfect consistency with the usual order of Providence, it was not till milder methods had been tried that resort was had to severer courses.

We have not dwelt minutely on the several plagues, nor shall we enter at length upon the institution of the Passover, and all the different circumstances of the Exodus, as they seem to have but little bearing on the life and character of Moses. There is one circumstance, however, which may require some special comment. We read[3] that on the eve of their departure they "borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment; and the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, and they spoiled the Egyptians." This act of the Israelites "spoiling the Egyptians" has been objected to, as a breach of faith

[1] Ex. iv. 23. [2] Ex. xii. 29—30. [3] Ex. xii. 35, 36.

in not returning the things which they are described as having "borrowed" of them. But it is by no means certain that the two actions refer to the same thing; and even if they did, the word "borrow" in the English text may signify to "ask" in the Hebrew, which they might innocently have done, and there was then no wrong committed in keeping the things which had been gratuitously given. It has also been ingeniously remarked, that as the Israelites had been long employed on the public works, it is more than probable that some proportion of wages was due to them, and that what they now received and carried off as spoil was no more than the arrears of wages justly due to their account. Thus also a sort of price of their redemption was paid, and the event became more emphatically typical of a Redemption to come, according to the description of the Psalmist, "He brought them forth also with silver and gold, there was not one feeble person among their tribes."[1] The great design of calling out a peculiar people, and of placing Moses at their head as Judge and Lawgiver of Israel, was rapidly receiving its accomplishment. How great a change was that which had exalted him from a desert to a judgment-seat! See him, but a few short months before, a shepherd in the lonely wilderness; thence sallying forth as a pilgrim with staff in hand, venturing all upon the faith of the miraculous vision which he had witnessed, and alone

[1] Ps. cv. 37.

CHAP. II.

setting out, to encounter single-handed, or at least with one solitary companion, the whole might and wisdom of Egypt"—that cherished land of art and science. How contrary to all human probability that such an errand should succeed! We see nothing enthusiastic, nothing savouring of ambitious dreams; no thought of personal aggrandisement among the motives which animated Moses on this occasion of his Divine mission. If he obeyed the call, which thus led him from a life of comparative ease and retirement to one of toil and painful responsibility, it was reluctantly and with many misgivings. But out of weakness he was made strong by an invisible power;—while his own sense of the infirmities with which even the best of men are encompassed, deepened by a long experience in the school of adversity, and by the many trials of a chequered life, well fitted him for the cares of government, and gave him a ready sympathy in the wants and infirmities of others.

We may observe, in passing, the truly Catholic character of many of the passages in the life of Moses. They show the high rank he must ever occupy in his historic, independently of his personal, capacity, as principal actor in these scenes. The oppressions and afflictions of Israel are forcible images of the sufferings of the Church in every age. The land of Egypt, and the house of bondage, are plainly the dominion of sin, and the service of the Prince of Darkness; and the deliverance

from bondage no less forcibly represents the great future deliverance. Jehovah is now "our Father which hath bought us;"[1] "the blood of the Lamb sprinkled on the door-posts"[2] of the children of Israel is that more precious blood of the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world;"[3] we, like them, but in a far higher sense, were to become the "redeemed" people of the Lord, brought out from the natural condition of helplessness and misery into communion with the one true God; to be the depositories of His revealed will, and, under the sense of their manifold obligations, to walk in all His ways, and to love Him, and to serve the Lord our God with all the heart, and with all the soul."[4] And, as if to impress the parallel on our minds, it was so contrived that the *means* were as emblematic as the action itself. There was not only the "silver and gold" and the "death of the firstborn," but another and more distinct witness of Him who "came by *water* and blood."[5] The baptism of water in the Red Sea, and the consecration of the people to their covenant state "in the cloud and in the sea,"[6] were no less typical than the blood of the Paschal lamb itself, of the future blessings of that better and more enduring covenant which was to be ratified in the blood of Christ, and sealed at the baptismal font. We might pursue

[1] Deut. xxxii. 6.
[2] Ex. xii. 3-7, 21, 22.
[3] John i. 29.
[4] Deut. x. 12.
[5] 1 John v. 6.
[6] 1 Cor. x. 2.

CHAP. II.

the parallel further, were it not anticipating the sequel of the history. The passage of the Red Sea was the point at which we had just arrived. There, at a place where the sea is some eight or nine miles across, and where the temple-fortress of Baalzephon overlooked the mountain gorge of Pihahiroth, the Israelites, numbering 600,000 fighting men, besides women and children, and a mixed multitude of retainers, passed over before their enemies, the sea making a safe and dry passage before them, while it swallowed up the Egyptian host in its depths. The "strong east wind,"[1] of which the writer makes special mention, might have tempted the Egyptians to imagine that it was the force of the elements, and not the power of the Almighty, which drove back the waves, and that, therefore, the pursuers might follow in safety. We might otherwise wonder at the selection of that solitary circumstance, in a narrative which supplies so few particulars. There were probably many others handed down by tradition:—the Jewish historian tells us[2] of fierce wind and tempests, storms of hail and rain, fearful thunderings and lightnings; and so, too, the Psalmist[3], "The waters saw Thee, O God, the waters saw Thee, and were afraid; the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water; the air thundered,

[1] Ex. xiv. 21.
[2] Joseph. *Ant.* lib. ii.
[3] Ps. lxxvii. 16, &c. See also Ps. lxxviii. 13; Is. lxiii. 11, 12; Habak. iii. 15; Wisdom xix. 7, &c.

and Thine arrows went abroad. The voice of Thy thunder was heard round about; the lightning shone upon the ground; the earth was moved, and shook withal." If we may believe Artapanus, as quoted by Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus[1], the people of Heliopolis, in Egypt, were wont to give much the same account of the Exodus as this in Holy Writ; but those of Memphis ascribed the escape of the Israelites to the artifice of Moses in marching over his army at a time of low water. We may trace, in the hesitating and contradictory statements of Manetho, a reluctant testimony to the substantial truth of the Scripture narrative. It is, however, to be remarked that, in a matter of this kind, the authority of Jewish tradition alone would be sufficient. It comes down to us as part and parcel of their national history: the idea of imposture at some later period is, as we have stated in a former chapter[2], effectually precluded by the circumstances of the case. We have now to follow Moses in a new stage of his career, and through the labours of his public administration.

Contemporary History of Egypt. — Beyond the scattered notices in Scripture, the principal authorities to be consulted on the early history of Egypt are these: Herodotus, Manetho, Eratosthenes, Diodorus, Plutarch. Herodotus, B.C. 460; Manetho, B.C. 280; Eratosthenes, B.C. 240; Diodorus, B.C. 56.

Of these, Manetho and Eratosthenes were natives of Egypt;

[1] Præp. Evang. ix. 27; Strom. i. [2] See above, Chap. i. p. 15.

CHAP. II.

Manetho belonged to an ancient order of priests of Heliopolis, and was employed by Ptolemy Philadelphus to translate into Greek the lists of kings which were preserved in the temples, and also to collect the historical records of their reigns. Unfortunately we have only a few fragments of both these authors, preserved by Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius, but the lists of kings are tolerably perfect, and comprise thirty dynasties, from Menes, the first king, to Darius. If the transcribers of Manetho were all agreed, we might here have some certain data. But the lists in Africanus, who came a century before Eusebius, show the number of 452 kings, while in Eusebius, the number is 334; and there are other considerable differences between them. In the Greek authors we meet with still greater differences. Thus, Herodotus and Diodorus, while they agree in stating that Egypt was first governed for a long period by gods, then by demigods, and lastly by mortals, yet entirely disagree in the names of these pretended sovereigns, in the duration of their reigns, and in the acts which they performed. The Egyptian priests, indeed, told Herodotus, "that they had always computed the years, and kept written accounts of them with the greatest accuracy." — *Herod.* ii. 145. "But as," says Sir John Stoddart, (*Introduction to Universal History*, p. 210,) they asserted this no less positively respecting the thousands of years of gods, than respecting the shorter reigns of mortal kings, the assertion was no doubt equally false in both cases." It seems also to have been almost brought to a demonstration by Böckh, that Manetho, in his dates, took for granted so many revolutions of a certain Sothiac period of 1460 years, arbitrarily assuming seventeen such periods for his reigns of gods, and three for the ordinary reigns, down to B.C. 1322, himself living in the next or fourth of these periods of mortal kings.

If we go to the Greek authors, Diodorus tells us that up to the time of Alexander the Great, Egypt had been governed 33,000 years; — the first 18,000 by gods and demigods, and the last 15,000 by men. It is at once obvious, that for the matter of dates at least, we had better turn to some better guides than either the Greeks or the Egyptian priests. Now Manetho's account, though doubtless in some particulars he was much prejudiced, as all Egyptians were, in favour of some fabulous antiquity

of his nation and religion, and these prejudices perhaps were newly awakened by the large concourse of Jews under Ptolemy Philadelphus, and the recent LXX translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, yet can we not suppose that setting apart his obvious passion for magnifying *ad libitum* the historic periods, he would venture upon an entire perversion of any notorious fact within the range of existing records. He is therefore not unfrequently regarded as on the whole our safest guide to the antiquities of Egypt. He makes the total of years from Menes to Alexander, 3555 (compare, above, the three Sothiac periods of Böckh, which nearly coincide). Others, with Dr. Lepsius, and many able modern critics, go rather to Eratosthenes,—a fragment of which celebrated author affords a useful "canon" of computation, where he gives the names of certain Memphite kings, from the first foundation of Memphis to the capture of that city by the Shepherd Kings during the reign of *Amun Timæus;* assigning to this period 1076 years.

Before we pass on to compare results, it may be expedient to premise something as to the Hebrew and LXX chronologies. These notoriously differ by many years. The tendency of modern criticism, however, inclines decidedly to the adoption of the LXX, which adds 600 to the years from the Creation to the Flood; and about 800 from the Flood to the call of Abraham. The LXX chronology is confirmed by Josephus, and we are indebted to the learned Dr. Hales, in his *Analysis of Sacred Chronology*, &c., for an elaborate revision of the LXX computation which he clearly shows to be the more reliable of the two; nay, the only one consistent with the known facts of history. We are now prepared for the question, Do any of these writers mention the Exodus? and if so, what light do they throw on the time at which it happened? In Diodorus we find the following account: "A plague having broke out in Egypt, many persons attributed the cause of the evil to the anger of the Divinity; for there were many strangers there from all parts, who used foreign rites in the sacred ministries and sacrifices, whence it came to pass that the ancient honours of the gods fell into neglect; and the original inhabitants began to fear that unless they removed from among them the foreigners, they should never be relieved from their afflictions. The men of other nations, therefore, were expelled;

CHAP. II.

and of these the noblest and bravest, under the guidance of Danaus, Cadmus, and other celebrated leaders, came into Greece and the parts adjacent; but the more numerous body were driven out into Judæa, a country adjoining to Egypt, but at that time wholly deserted. *The leader* of this colony *was named Moses, a man of excellent wisdom and fortitude,* who, occupying that region, built there many cities, and particularly the most celebrated of all, Jerusalem, with its temple."—*Diod.* i. 40.

The account of Manetho is broken into two parts. In the first part he relates how, "in the reign of *Timæus*" (comp. the "*Amun Timæus*" of Eratosthenes, above), "there came men of ignoble birth out of the Eastern parts, and had boldness enough to make an expedition into our country, . . . rebuilt the city of Avaris on the Bubastic channel of the Nile, and held the country 511 years: this whole nation was called Hycsos, *i.e.* 'Shepherd Kings:'—that at last another king of Egypt, Thummosis by name, came to a composition with them to leave Egypt, and go, without any harm done to them, whithersoever they would; so they went away with their whole families and effects, not fewer than 240,000, and took their journey into Syria, and built a city named Jerusalem."—Manetho, quoted by Josephus, *lib. c. Apion.*, § 14. Subsequently, and much to the indignation of Josephus, the Egyptian historian introduces the same people as invited back again, to occupy the said city of Avaris, by certain disaffected subjects in Egypt, who had also been cast out of the rest of the country as leprous and maimed! That some of the learned priests also were polluted with them; and that they appointed themselves a ruler out of the priests of Heliopolis, whose name was Osarsiph, changed afterwards to *Moses;* that he made this law for them, that they should neither worship the Egyptian gods nor abstain from any one of those sacred animals which they have in the highest esteem, but kill and destroy all. . . . That because of their strength and number, King Amenophis was obliged to hide himself in Ethiopia, out of their reach, for thirteen years . . . after which, however, he, with his son Ramses, joined battle with the Shepherds and the polluted people . . . and pursued them to the bounds of Syria." Josephus adduces other instances of a concerted plan among the Greek and Egyptian authors to vilify his countrymen and their ancestors; and particularly Lysimachus, whose account bears still more evident marks of being only a

distorted tradition of the Exodus. He says, "The people of the Jews being leprous and scabby, and subject to certain other kinds of distempers, in the days of Bocchoris, King of Egypt, fled to the temples and got their food there by begging, and their numbers being very great, there arose a scarcity in Egypt. Hereupon the king sent to consult the oracle of Jupiter Ammon, and obtained instruction to purge out the impure and impious people, and expel them into desert places. Accordingly the king ordered this to be done, and to take the leprous people, and wrap them in sheets of lead and let them down into the sea. Hereupon some were drowned, and the rest were gotten together and sent into desert places, in order to be exposed to destruction. In this plight they assembled themselves together and took counsel what they should do, and determined that, as the night was coming on, they should kindle fires and lamps, and keep watch; that they also should fast the next night, and propitiate the gods in order to obtain deliverance from them. On the next day there was one Moses, who advised them that they should venture on a journey, and go along one road till they should come to places fit for habitation; that he charged them to have no kind regards for any man, nor give good counsel to any, but always to advise them for the worst, and to overturn all those temples and altars of the gods they should meet with; that the rest commended what he had said with one consent, and did what they had resolved on, and so travelled over the desert. But that the difficulties of the journey being over, they came to a country inhabited, and that there they abused the men, and plundered and burnt their temples, and then came into that land which is called Judæa, and there they built a city, and dwelt therein; and that their city was termed '*Hierosyla*,' from this their robbing of the temples; but they afterwards, from pure shame, changed the name to *Hierosolyma*."—*Lib. c. Apion.*, § 26, 28, 34. Well might the united ignorance and insolence of such a charge as the latter fire the indignation of Josephus. "So we see," he says, "that this fine fellow hath such an unbounded inclination to reproach us, that he did not understand that robbery of temples is not expressed by the same word and name among the Jews as it is among the Greeks!" A more surprising thing is, that Josephus himself, in his equally blind desire to magnify the antiquity of his

CHAP. II.

countrymen, by associating the Exodus exclusively with the earlier part of the account above quoted from Manetho, which would make the Israelites the "Shepherd Kings," should not have perceived the obvious application of the latter part of it to that event, and the painful but palpable perversion of the true account there obviously to be detected. Had it been the express object of Manetho to mix up the most incongruous things, and to throw discredit on a transaction, the truth of which he could neither wholly suppress nor openly deny, he could scarcely have devised a better or more artful method. He has so effectually confounded the two separate events, viz., the Exodus of the Hebrews and the expulsion of the Phœnician Shepherds, — Osarsiph, with Joseph, and both with Moses, &c.,— that it is scarcely to be wondered at that Josephus himself was deceived; and regardless of the existence, elsewhere so often recognised, of a race of Shepherd Kings, in his zeal to apply it to his own ancestors, altered the very signification of the term, and made the Hycsos to mean Shepherd-*captives!* Chæremon, Artapanus, and others, might be urged in further proof of this event being mentioned by heathen writers; but we will proceed at once to the next point, viz. the date of the Exodus. After which we shall endeavour to ascertain the name of the reigning sovereign of Egypt, and what was the condition of that celebrated people at the time?

I. *The date of the Exodus.*

After what has been said as to the great disparities between the Hebrew and the LXX chronologies, we cannot but be struck by observing, in the first place, that the date of the Exodus is nearly the same in both those systems; the Hebrew, according to Ussher, placing it B.C. 1491; and the LXX, according to Scaliger, 1497 (varying in other accounts from 1509 to 1593). —See Hale's *Chronology*, vol. i. p. 215, ed. 1830; Sir John Stoddart, *Introduction, Dissert.* 2. But besides this, we believe we can show a convergency of other circumstances pointing to the same period for the date in question. To show this we have but to estimate (1) from the Flood to Menes, the first king of Egypt; (2) from Menes to the celebrated XVIIIth Dynasty; (3) from Dynasty XVIII. to the Exodus. (1.) As to the first of

these periods, considering the probable identification of Menes with Mizraim, the son of Ham (for which see Cumberland's *Sanchoniatho*, § 2; ditto, *Notes on the Table of Eratosthenes*, § 2; Shuckford, *Sacred and Profane History*. b. xi.), and that Egypt, being contiguous to Arabia and Central Asia, was probably peopled soon after the Flood, we may here side with the calculation which places the foundation of Memphis by Menes about 290 years after the Flood.[1] (2.) On the next period, viz. from Menes to Dynasty XVIII., we shall be assisted at once by the Canon of Eratosthenes, referred to above, and which gives from the foundation of Memphis, by Menes, to its capture by the Shepherd Kings, who put an end to the XVIth Dynasty, 1076 years. Adding to this, 103 years for the duration of Dynasty XVII. (as Eusebius gives it from Manetho), we have from Menes to the beginning of Dynasty XVIII. a total of years 1076 + 103 = 1179. But to check this part of the calculation, (as it is here, perhaps, that the principal difficulty lies,) let us take the dates assigned to this second period by the most approved modern Egyptologers. (*a.*) Rawlinson and Wilkinson (see Rawlinson's *Herod.* vol. ii., Append. b. 2, c. viii.) give us,

From Menes to Dynasty VI.				700 yrs.
From Dynasty VI. to Dynasty XVIII.,				
At the longest, 625	Mean Period	625		
At the shortest, 511		511		
		2) 1136		568 „
		568		
Total of years from Menes to Dynasty XVIII. .				1268 „

(*b.*) Osburn gives us Dyn. I.—Dyn. XII. = 470 years; Dyn. XII. to end of Dyn. XIX. = 645 years; total, 1115 years. Subtract 194 years for duration of Dyn. XIX., the remainder = period from Dyn. I. (or Menes) to Dyn. XVIII. = 921 years. (See Osburn's *Egypt*, ii. 633.) Comparing these with our former

[1] It will be seen afterwards that this computation would give for the date of Menes, B. C. 3343. But as this date in a measure rules the rest, (though even, in case of error, it would be easy to allow

CHAP. II.

results, and taking the average of the three, we have—

$$\begin{array}{r} 1179 \\ 1268 \\ 921 \\ \hline 3\,)\,3368 \\ \hline 1122 \end{array}$$

years as the approximate duration of the second interval.

(3.) Proceeding now to the third subdivision of our period, we must observe that the Shepherd Kings, after they had possessed themselves of Memphis, and held it during Dynasty XVII., were in turn overcome and finally expelled by Amosis (sometimes written Tethmosis, Tutmosis, &c.), the first king of Dynasty XVIII. And this, be it observed, is no obscure period of Egyptian history; but with the joint aid of the monuments, of recent researches, and of historical documents, we here enter on a comparatively lucid field, where some tolerable certainty begins to be had. We shall, therefore, have less difficulty in settling the interval now under our consideration. The first point will be to ascertain when Joseph arrived in Egypt. In answer, there can scarcely be a doubt, after the great pains that have been bestowed by Dr. Hales, and other archæologists in this field of research, that Joseph arrived in Egypt at a time when Hycsos oppression was now past, and when it must have rendered the name of Shepherd "an abomination to the Egyptians." (See Gen. xlvi. 34.) We have other intimations (Gen. xlii. 9; xlvii.

for it in adding up the three periods, the effect being simply to throw the total date of the Exodus somewhat earlier or later), it may be better here to take another estimate of the date of Menes, derived from two celebrated German Egyptologers, Lepsius and Uhleman. Lepsius, going by the extracts in *Syncellus* (A.D. 760) from the "*Anonymous Chronicle*" of the Kings of Egypt, makes the date of Menes B.C. 3892; Uhleman (*Ægyptisch. Alterthumskunde*, iii. 12) makes it B.C. 2782. Taking the average of which gives us,—

$$\begin{array}{r} 3892 \\ 2782 \\ \hline 2\,)\,6674 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

B.C. 3337 for another approximate date of Menes.

6). "Ye are spies; to see the nakedness of the land ye are come," can imply no less than a suspicion, at the time spoken of, that opportunities were still watched for on the Phœnician or Syrian side for fresh invasions,— a probability, therefore, that the memory of some earlier ones was still fresh. Nor is it probable that Joseph would have been required to "look out" from among the Israelites, "men of activity "(see xlvii. 6) to take charge of the cattle in Egypt, had not a strong aversion still subsisted among the Egyptians to an occupation associated with their late oppressors. Again, if Joseph had arrived before the expulsion of the Shepherds, the latter event could hardly fail to have been named in the Scripture history, during the subsequent years of the Israelites' sojourn in Egypt. So great an event could hardly have passed without, at least, some allusion to it. And Dr. Hales has very clearly shown, that the persecution of the Israelites, which arose after Joseph, was not under the sway of the Shepherd Dynasty, but arose from quite a different quarter; and in short, that Joseph came to Egypt some time (Dr. Hales puts it at 13, Bishop Cumberland at 96, Kitto at 70, years) after the Shepherd Dynasty was put an end to by Amosis, at the commencement of the XVIIIth Dynasty. (See also, to the same effect, Kitto's *History of Palestine*, b. i. c. ii., and *Pictorial Bible*, note on Ex. i. 8.) Only that Kitto is peculiar in not making the expulsion under Amosis the actual termination of the Shepherds' reign, the total duration of which he computes, after Manetho, at 511 years: but instead of these years expiring with the reign of Amosis, he puts Amosis only 250 years after the beginning of that period;—not attempting to explain what became of the Shepherd Kings afterwards, and as if they had received a second expulsion and subjugation after another 261 years, though we have nowhere any record of it. From Joseph's arrival we must add 23 years, according to the Scripture account, between that and the arrival of Jacob, and thence, for the sojourn of Israel in Egypt until their final departure at the Exodus, 215 years. (See Stackhouse, b. iii, c. v., *Dissertation* 5; Mant's *Bible*, notes on Ex. xii, 30.)

Putting now all these intervals, (1), (2), and (3), together, we have

CHAP. II.

	Years.
(1.) From the Flood to Menes . . .	200
(2.) From Menes to Dynasty XVIII. . .	1122
(3.) From beginning of Dynasty XVIII. to Exodus (13 + 23 + 215)	251
Total years from the Flood to the Exodus . .	1573

Now for the Flood we have two very different dates; the Hebrew B.C. 2348, the LXX and Josephus (as corrected by Dr. Hales) B.C. 3758.

$$\text{Average date of Flood} \left\{ \begin{array}{r} 3758 \\ 2348 \\ \hline 2\,)\ 1410 \\ \hline 705 \end{array} \qquad \left.\begin{array}{r} 2348 \\ 705 \\ \hline 3053 \end{array}\right\} \text{B.C. } 3053. \right.$$

Subtracting from this the number of years from Flood to Exodus, we have for

$$\text{Date of Exodus} \left\{ \begin{array}{r} 3053 \\ 1573 \\ \hline 1480 \end{array} \right\} \text{B.C. } 1480;$$

a remarkable approximation, at least, to the traditionary date of this event, as taken above from the Hebrew and LXX.

II. *The reigning Sovereign of Egypt, and condition of that country, at the time of the Exodus.*

There remains the last question, as to the name of the reigning sovereign in Egypt,—the Pharaoh whose armies were overthrown in the Red Sea. That the Egyptian priests and chroniclers would studiously have concealed both the nature of the disaster and the name of the sovereign, we can easily imagine. It may be reserved to future researches among the monuments, already so fruitful of important results, to throw fresh light on these points. As it is, we may justly say of those monuments, "cum tacent, clamant." "Loaded as they are," observes Sir John Stoddart, "with innumerable records of the triumphs of their kings, their silence on this point decisively shows that the expulsion was productive to Egypt of nothing but misery and dis-

grace. Different chronologists having fixed this event at B.C. 1648, 1608, 1593, 1509, and 1491, all which dates fall within Manetho's period of the XVIIIth Dynasty, it follows that several sovereigns of that dynasty have been supposed to be the Pharaoh who then reigned, *e.g.*, Memphres, Amenophthis, Achencheres, &c.; but it does not appear that the discoveries hitherto made, either corroborate or weaken any of these conjectures." Stoddart, *Introduction to Universal History*, p. 215. Notwithstanding, however, the uncertainty here expressed by the learned writer, many things point strongly to one particular reign. It should also be borne in mind, that we are far more likely to get upon the traces of any given event in early history, by attending to names and circumstances, than by binding ourselves to chronological calculations, the dates of which must always, in the varying modes of computation, and at the great distance of time, be subject to very considerable suspicion. It is, however, an old opinion, and confirmed by circumstantial evidence, as well as by the conclusions of thoughtful inquirers, that the king concerned in the Exodus was the last king of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Manetho, as reported by Josephus, calls him expressly Amenophis, and, to distinguish him from other kings of the same name, he tells us he was the father of Ramses and Armais, or, as he elsewhere calls them, Sethos and Danaus. Though Manetho contrives to varnish over the true facts of the history, and to hide the real nature of a catastrophe which involved disgrace and defeat to the Egyptians, we have no reason to impute to him any wilful concealment or perversion of the name of the sovereign, any more than of that of Moses on the other side, which he reports correctly enough. We have in the same book of Josephus, *lib. c. Apion.*, i. § 32, the further authority of Chæremon, a Greek historian, for ascribing the event to this reign. As the tables of the Egyptian dynasties may not be at hand, it may be convenient here to transcribe the brief but very exact list in Josephus of the whole XVIIIth Dynasty, which he has evidently preserved with special care. His account is as follows,—*lib. c. Apion.*, i. § 15: "Tethmosis, who drove out the Shepherds, reigned afterward twenty-five years and four months, and then died; after him, his son Chebron took the kingdom for thirteen years; after whom came Amenophis, for twenty years and seven months; then

CHAP. II.

came his sister Amessis, for twenty-one years and nine months; after her came Mephres, for twelve years and nine months; after him was Mephramuthosis, for twenty-five years and ten months; after him, Tethmosis, for nine years and eight months; after him came Amenophis, for thirty years and ten months; after him came Orus, for thirty-six years and five months; after him came his daughter Acenchres, for twelve years and one month; then was her brother Rathotis, for nine years; then was Achencheres, for twelve years and five months; then another Achencheres, for twelve years and three months; after him Armais, for four years and one month; after him was Ramesses, for one year and four months; after him came Ramesses Miammoun, for sixty-six years and two months; after him *Amenophis*, for nineteen years and six months; after him [Sethosis and] *Ramesses*, who had an army of horse and a naval force." From what he says afterwards, it seems that Sethosis and Ramesses were the same. There was another brother, Armais the Second, or Danaus, but Ramesses was the successor on the throne; and with him commences the next dynasty, viz., Dynasty XIX. And here comes a remarkable circumstance: — both Sethosis, Ramesses, and his next successor, Rhampses, have very long reigns: to the first 59, and to the second 66 years are ascribed. Here at once there appears a suspicion of some king being omitted altogether, and the years of his reign added to his successor's. The omitted king might be some father, or son associated with his father, who fell a victim in the Red Sea, or on the sudden death of the first-born. We have another landmark, as it were, in the royal name, so common about this time, viz., Ramses, or Ramessis. Now the frontier-city of the same name might well be imagined to be called after the first king of this name, and it was built, we know, at the time of the Exodus, because the Israelites were at that time employed in building it, as we read (Ex. i. 11): "They did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamses." Both these circumstances agree well with the supposition of Amenophis being king at the time, who was father to one, and grandson or son of another Ramses. Kitto's advocacy of the earlier reign of Thotmes III. (see note, Ex. ii. 12), as the date required, implies throughout an earlier date for the Shepherd expulsion.

That author agrees with us, in making Joseph's arrival shortly after the expulsion of the Shepherd-Kings, and that they were expelled under Amosis at the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty. But from the beginning of their reign to the reign of this Amosis, he makes only 250 years, though he allows for the total of their reign 511 years; whereas, according to the usual account, these 511 years expire with Amosis; and as Joseph arrived very shortly after, this of course brings down his arrival, and the time of the Exodus along with it, to a much later period than Kitto. It is not, therefore, surprising that this writer should have referred the Exodus to the earlier reign of Thotmes III., in the middle of Dynasty XVIII. Yet this is to contradict or ignore the express authority of Josephus, who in this particular dynasty (the XVIIIth) evidently bestowed the most minute attention on the names and dates of his kings, and who plainly refers the Shepherd expulsion to Amosis, the first king of the XVIIIth Dynasty. Nor is he suspected of being wrong in his names and dates, though, as we have before observed, he was misled to confound the two distinct events of the expulsion and the Exodus. The bricks, in making which the Israelites were made to labour, would suit well enough with either, as it appears that, from Thotmes III. onwards, this material was more and more used in the great public works and monuments of Egypt. (See Rawlinson's *Herod.*, b. ii. § 136.)

Kitto well remarks: "The fact of his abundant use of bricks is not the least interesting or important of those numerous corroborations of the Pentateuch which the study of Egyptian antiquities has of late years produced." The same author, in what he says of the "horses" of Pharaoh,—so circumstantially introduced in the account of the Exodus,—has omitted a distinction which throws considerable light on our subject. He says: "wherever armies are represented on the monuments of Egypt, they are represented as composed of troops of infantry armed with bow or lance, and of ranks of chariots drawn by two horses." And of such chariots and their mounted drivers, he interprets the Scripture expression of the "horse and the rider;" and again, "The Egyptians pursued and went after them into the midst of the sea, even all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen." But he does not seem aware, that even this limited introduction of horse into the armies of Egypt may be

CHAP. II.

looked upon as another indication of the XVIIIth Dynasty. For we are assured by Wilkinson that it was during the reign of Amosis that mention is first made of the horse on the monuments; but that neither at the tombs about the Pyramids, nor at Beni Hassan, is there any indication of the horse, though the animals of the country are so numerous in their paintings. (See Rawlinson's *Herod.*, Appendix, b. ii. § 18.)

If we now search further among the monuments, we may even get nearer upon the track of the fated monarch of the Exodus. We are now speaking at second hand, as we have not ourselves travelled among the ruins of Egypt. But it appears there is a king, called Si-phtha on the monuments, of whom Mr. Osburn tells us (*Egypt*, vol. ii. c. ix.) "that there is a tomb at Biban-el-Malook, near Thebes, commenced with great magnificence by a monarch who never lay in it, and who may be identified with the Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea. His hieroglyphic name is Siphtha." Another account adds, "The tomb of Siphtha, in the Babel-Malook, originally exhibited on its walls his shield and that of his wife; but they have been covered with plaster, and other inscriptions substituted for them. The name of the king who thus usurped the sepulchre of another is not clearly made out, owing to the number of characters, not phonetic, with which the shield is filled; but it seems to be Merir or Merira. His name is also on the granite sarcophagus which remains, though broken. In the Procession of Medinet-Aboo, his shield follows that of Seti Meneptha the Second. We cannot, therefore, question his royal dignity. (Kenrick's *Egypt*, b. ii. p. 325.) Rosellini, *Mon. Stor.* iii. 2, calls him Uerri, or Remerri. "Remerri himself," he adds, "never reigned." Thus we have one king who "never reigned," and another who "never lay in the tomb prepared for him;" it might be possible, between these two to discover the right king of the Exodus. An excellent writer, who takes him for the 3rd Amenophis, says, "This Remerri was the first-born of Pharaoh, and, as was customary, the colleague of his father in the kingdom, the prince who fell a victim to the obstinacy of his sire, and perished prematurely on that dread night, when the destroyer passed through the land and smote the first-born of the Egyptians. The first-born of Pharaoh, dying prematurely, had failed to prepare

himself a tomb, and Amenophis having perished ere the embalmment of his son was completed, the latter was hastily placed in the sepulchre his father had constructed for himself, while his subjects, little solicitous at such an awful crisis of transmitting his name to posterity, were content, in their despair, to record his titles on plaster, instead of undertaking the more tedious process of graving them on such material as might ensure perpetuity." Groves, *Echoes of Egypt* (Rivington, 1857), pp. 177, 178.

Sir Gardner Wilkinson, who began by regarding Thotmes III. (the 7th king of Dynasty XVIII. on the list of Josephus) as the monarch of the Exodus, (see *Antiq. Eg.*, vol. i. pp. 77, 81,) gives afterwards the preference to the reign of Pthahmen, as suggested by the Duke of Northumberland, Pthahmen being the 3rd king of Dynasty XIX. (See *Herod.*, App., b. ii. c. viii. § 24, 25.)

And generally we may observe, that the later dates for the Exodus seem to be growing in favour with modern Egyptologers. They are not incompatible with the line of argument above taken. For in this case the authors differ as much in the dynasty as in the date. Thus, when Dr. Lepsius gives us, B.C, 1314, Osburn nearly the same, Bunsen, B.C. 1320, for the date of the Exodus, it is not that they take this for the proper date of Amenophis III., to whose reign we have referred this event in Dynasty XVIII.; but they suppose it to have occurred somewhere in Dynasty XIX. We can only say, that such an opinion is not to be lightly disregarded; and that many of the foregoing arguments apply equally to such later period and date, —they would seem to exclude only the supposition of any much *earlier one.* According to some authors, the most certain thing in Egyptian chronology is the date of Thotmes III., of Dynasty XVIII., for which, they say, we have definite astronomical data, pointing to B.C. 1445. And if this be so it will bring down Amenophis III. to a later date than has been assigned him above, and will a little displace all our other dates; but to rectify this we should only have to assign a somewhat later date for the building of Memphis by Menes than that which we have taken (viz. 200 years after the Flood), and date it nearer to the time assigned for the dispersion by the LXX chronology, viz. after the Flood 531. *Adhuc sub judice;* — and it may be reserved for some future

CHAP. II.

discoveries among the monuments to throw fresh light on the subject.

From what has been stated we may at least be sure, that, at the time of the Exodus, the kingdom of Egypt was at the full height of power and prosperity. Next to the Pyramid-period, it was the era of the greatest and most splendid national monuments, which still perpetuate the names of its most illustrious monarchs. The RAMSES, in particular, seem to have surpassed other monarchs in the magnificence of their tombs and palaces. It is not agreed what exact influence the irruption and long sway of the Arabian and Phœnician settlers, from whom the Shepherd Kings were descended, might have had on the religion of the country. Egyptian annalists would naturally fasten upon them the stigma of being disturbers of the national faith, and vilify them, as they did afterwards with the Israelites, by every false representation: but it is probable that they introduced purer and more primitive ideas of religion than those which had taken root in the national worship of Egypt, and which were zealously adopted and propagated by the native races of kings. These kings also amalgamated with their own office, that of being Supreme Pontiffs, and chief among the Priests of their religion. Their notions, however, were materialistic and idolatrous; they taught the worship of the Sun [1] and heavenly bodies; they deified the powers of nature; or else paid divine honours to departed kings, whom they embalmed and laid up in royal tombs, under the full belief that they were still alive, and, re-assuming the same bodily form, would hereafter bring back the fabled reigns of the demigods, and keep up a perpetual succession of kings to almost infinite ages. Between these and the more primitive ideas (kept alive by tradition in the East, and imported afresh by the Phœnician Shepherds), there appears to have been kept up a continual struggle. Fresh impetus would, doubtless, be given to the better side by the intercourse, not ambiguously recorded in Scripture, between Egypt and the Patriarch Abraham.

[1] Hence, under the vernacular name *Ra*, we so often find it in the etymology of Egyptian names, as in Pha-*ra*-oh, *Ra*-mesis, Potiphar, abbreviated from Potipha-*ra*, i.e. Priest of the Sun, &c. Compare Heliopolis, or *On*, and other names compounded with "on."

There is much in the slight glimpses we have of the conduct of Abimelech, to show that there was at that time no special animosity, nor ill-feeling of any kind, towards the professors of a purer faith. As time went on, and during the long governorship of Joseph, the kindly feeling would even have improved. His eminent services to the king and country must have laid them under no inconsiderable obligations. The "Canal of Joseph," and frequent other monuments called by his name, testify to this day, the honour in which he was held. Territorial and agrarian dispositions made under his hand, seem to have worked a permanent improvement in the royal finances, and to have been one great cause which contributed to the consolidation of the empire, and the growing power of the kings. At last when a "king arose which knew not Joseph," we have the spectacle of a mighty kingdom, which had attained the summit of temporal power, but which eventually bowed down to a false and idolatrous religion. No time, therefore, could have been more seasonable for the display of a mightier Power still, and for the deliverance of the Chosen Seed from the hand of their oppressors.

CHAP. III.

The Life of Moses.—Second Part.

"On Sinai's top, in prayer and trance,
Full forty nights and forty days,
The Prophet watch'd for one dear glance
Of Thee and of Thy ways.

So, separate from the world, his breast
Might duly take and strongly keep
The print of Heaven, to be express'd
Ere long on Sion's steep."

KEBLE.

CHAP. III.

THE Israelites are now speeding towards the Land of Promise. Let us direct our attention for a moment to the foremost figure in the group. He has had the experience of four score years of a chequered and anxious life. He is "meek above all the men which were upon the face of the earth;"[1] but it is the meekness of real wisdom, acquired by the painful experience of many trials, which have convinced him of his own frailty and the comfort of the Divine grace. A great gulf literally separates Him from his earliest associations. A wilderness lies before him, through which

[1] Num. xii. 3.

he must struggle in the prosecution of the great purpose with which he is commissioned from Heaven,— a wilderness where but of late he had spent a long season of obscurity and poverty. If the thought of the one might have elated, the recollections of the other were well fitted to humble him. He has, too, upon his shoulders the burden of a numerous and rapidly-increasing people. He has to lead them in war, to instruct them in peace, to wean them from the corrupt notions and corrupter habits of Egypt, and to train them for a new and prominent position among the nations of the earth. Shall he be left to the fertile resources of his own mind? to his human strength and wisdom? Shall he tend his people with no other help than what he needed when he kept his father's sheep in the wilderness? Or what shall be that meeting of his God, which was promised him on the selfsame mountain of Midian where he had tracked the humble sheepwalk? How full must have been his heart, as he mused on the mysterious promise! How ardent his prayer, that it might carry with it some preternatural strength equal to his need!

For it was not long before the murmuring of the people broke out. The waters were bitter[1], or the food was scanty; others said, "We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely, the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the

[1] Ex. xv. 23; xvi. 4.

CHAP. III.

onions, and the garlick;"[1] but now they were dying with hunger and thirst, and they cast all the blame on their leader, and were "ready to stone him."[2] The smiting of the rock with the same miraculous rod which had been the instrument of performing so many wonders in Egypt, is permitted to relieve the thirst, and the manna falls in grateful plenty from heaven, to supply the place of food. These are some of the modes by which present relief was given. That they had often occasion, like other travellers, to dig wells for themselves, and to labour thus for a natural supply, seems implied in the very contrast drawn between their wilderness-condition and the advantages to be enjoyed in Canaan. For there they were to find wells "digged, which they digged *not*," "vineyards and olives, which they planted not." There seems no sufficient ground for concluding that the waters from "the smitten rock" did more than "follow" them for that particular stage of their journey. And of the manna we know that the supply was renewed every morning; "the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, till they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan."[3] But there was one provision, which more than all bespoke the Divine presence with His chosen people, and with His servant Moses. As they performed the perilous passage of the Red Sea, a cloud had been seen hovering over the host. Its beacon-light

[1] Num. xi. 5. [2] Ex. xvii. 4. [3] Ex. xvi. 35.

had gone before them in the night; it again removed behind them and cast a shade upon their pursuers that they could not make way against it. In the morning it dazzled them with its brightness, and assisted in the rout and discomfiture of their hosts.[1] That same "pillar of a cloud" still accompanied the triumphant armies of Israel. When it rested, the camp was to be stationary,—when it moved, it was the signal for marching[2],—and where it led, was the direction of the march. By day it was in the form of a cloud, and a pillar of fire by night. When the tabernacle was erected, and the ark made, the same cloud rested upon them; and it became further the oracle of the Most High, and Moses had resort to it for the purposes of his ministry[3] when he needed the Divine counsel and direction, and he received thence the visible tokens of Divine favour and support.

Such preternatural assistances did not, however, supersede the necessity for more ordinary precautions. The care of all the people was growing too great a burden for their single ruler, when Jethro, his father-in-law, re-appears upon the scene, and meets him on his weary journey with the welcome greeting of a father and a friend. The scene is a touching one, where he restores the wife and children of Moses, which had been evidently under his charge from the day of his son's departure into Egypt;

[1] Ex. xiv. 19—26.
[2] Numb. ix. 17—23.
[3] Ex. xvi. 10, 11; xxxiii. 9—11; Deut. xxxi. 15.

CHAP. III.

and he further suggests the appointment of assistant officers, "rulers of thousands and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties and rulers of tens [1], who might relieve him of a part of his daily charge, for he saw that "the people stood by him from morning unto evening." "Thou wilt surely," said he, "wear away, and the people that is with thee: for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thyself alone." [2] So they "took them wise men, and understanding, and known among their tribes," and when Moses had charged them to "judge righteously and not to respect persons in judgment," [3] they entered on their duties, "to judge the people at all seasons; the hard causes they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves." [4] We see from this example that Moses was wise enough to value the timely counsel of a friend,—a disposition not found in those whose chief motive is a mere worldly ambition. We observe another illustration of this principle in his conduct to Hobab, a son of his father-in-law, whose experience in the hilly country and bleak passes of Midian, appeared to fit him for a serviceable guide; and we find Moses endeavouring to dissuade him from returning home, inviting him to partake with him at once in the toils and the

[1] Ex. xviii. 21.
[2] Ex. xviii. 18.
[3] Deut. i. 13, 16, 17.
[4] Ex. xviii. 26. Not to be confounded with the council of *Seventy Elders*, which we shall read of presently. These 'judges' must have amounted to many times that number.

honours of his enterprise, till he should reach the Promised Land.[1]

The first trial in arms on this side the Red Sea was not long in coming. It was occasioned by an unexpected attack of the Amalekites, and was remarkable on several accounts. It first introduces Joshua[2] to our notice, and it displays the justice of God in more severely punishing this people, as wilful offenders against the light afforded them, than other nations who knew not His will. The Amalekites were descendants of Esau, and must have known the promises made to Israel in the person of their common forefather Abraham, making over to them the countries to be conquered from the seven nations[3] of Canaan. The children of Esau had in like manner been allowed to appropriate the country of the Horims and of Mount Seir[4]; and was it for them to oppose the express will of the Almighty, now that Israel was about to enter on its inheritance? Yet, contrary to the Divine command, and actuated, perhaps, by some

[1] Num. x. 29—33.

[2] See Ex. xvii. 9. Otherwise called *Oshea*, and *Jesus*. Num. xiii. 8: "Of the tribe of Ephraim, *Oshea*, the son of Nun." See other notices of Joshua, Ex. xxiv. 13; xxxiii. 11; Num. xxvii. 18.

[3] "The Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, *seven* nations greater and mightier than thou." Deut. vii. 1. But in another place, Gen. xv. 19—21, *ten* nations are enumerated. Allowing the *Rephaims* of Genesis to answer to the *Hivites* of Deut., the remaining three nations, viz. the *Kenites*, *Kenizzites*, and *Kadmonites*, lived on *this side Jordan*, and are on this account omitted in the former list.

[4] Deut. ii. 5, 12, Gen. xxxvi. 8.

CHAP. III.

cowardly fear for their own possessions, or more likely by petty jealousy of their brethren, they made this unprovoked attack upon them, as they were just entering on their journey. They were not permitted to succeed, and it was specially enjoined upon Israel to make no peace with such a people till they had rooted out all remembrance of them from the land. The manner of the victory was destined further to illustrate the duty of perseverance in faith, and of direct dependence upon God, even in the use of ordinary means. While Joshua is ordered to the fight, Moses is to stand on the height with the rod of God in his hand. So long as that rod is held up shall Israel prevail; but Amalek, if the hand of Moses shall droop.[1] Supported by Aaron and Hur, the hands of Moses fail not, till the victory is complete on the side of Israel.

Recourse to arms was no more necessary till the last year of their circuitous route through the desert, when they had fairly entered on the campaign which was to give them possession of the land of Canaan. But we may say, by anticipation, that after a casual attack of Arad the Canaanite, who was soon defeated[2], two kings on this side of Jordan eastward were the chief opponents. And it is remarkable that these also, like the Amalekites,

[1] The opinion is not to be disregarded which makes this action of Moses a simple act of prayer. Either way of taking it, the blessing was to that which is of the true essence of prayer, viz. faith and a spirit of dependence upon God.

[2] Num. xxi. 1—4.

were the assailants, and not the children of Israel. They were, therefore, lawfully exposed to the consequences of a war provoked by their own act; and their kingdoms the lawful spoil of the conqueror. Nor were these in a similar situation with the seven guilty nations, whom Israel was to cast out of Canaan. So that the charge sometimes brought against this portion of Scripture history, as encouraging acts of indiscriminate slaughter, belongs not, strictly speaking, to the history of Moses at all. Yet, as Moses may be held responsible for what was done at his command, and as he certainly commanded Joshua and the people under him, on approaching nearer to the Promised Land to carry on this series of conquests till the seven nations of the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, were "smitten and utterly destroyed,"[1] it may be proper to glance briefly at a few considerations which may appear to justify this proceeding. However, then, we may lament the unhappy necessity for this apparently cruel and unsparing bloodshed, it cannot be forgotten that these nations had long been ripe for destruction. Since the days of Abraham[2], *i.e.* for more than 400 years, sentence had been passed against them for their iniquities; yet these were continually growing to a greater and

[1] Deut. iii. 21; vii. 1, 2.

[2] Gen. xv. 19-21.

CHAP. III.

greater pitch; and the long-suffering of God waited for them in vain. They now sacrificed their own sons and daughters to Moloch; and their hands were stained deep with innocent blood. The cities of Sodom and Gomorrah had not been spared; why should it be different with those nations, who only lived to imitate their vices? Israel herself was to expect no other treatment, if she gave way to the same evil courses; "As the nations which the Lord destroyed before their face, so were they to perish, if they would not be obedient to the voice of the Lord their God."[1] The crimes of those nations were violations of the very laws of humanity, and such as to render them amenable to human justice. Much more, then, were they justly punishable by the all-righteous decrees of Heaven, and the mode of inflicting that punishment must be allowed matter of inferior consequence. We see how it pleased God to make the Israelites His instruments in executing the sentence; and we have no right to canvass the wisdom of the means, when we can see the justice, not to say the mercy[2],

[1] Deut. viii. 20; Lev. xviii. 26, 28.

[2] Bishop Watson, in his justly admired *Apology*, remarks: "I am fond of considering the goodness of God as the leading principle of His conduct towards mankind; of considering His justice as subservient to His mercy. He punishes individuals and nations with the rod of His wrath; but I am persuaded that all His punishments originate in His abhorrence of sin, are calculated to lessen its influence, and are proofs of His goodness; inasmuch as it may not be possible for Omnipotence itself to communicate supreme happiness to the human race whilst they continue servants of sin.

of the end. This consideration must surely remove the apparent harshness of the act.

And further, it may be doubted whether violence was ever had recourse to, unprovoked by the enemy. On the contrary, it is maintained by many Jewish writers, that before an appeal to arms could be made, terms of peace were first offered; and no violence attempted till peaceable measures had failed. We have, certainly, much to this purpose in the express injunctions of Moses (Deut. xx. 10-14), "first to proclaim peace to a city; and if it make answer of peace, then all the people shall be tributaries to thee, and shall serve thee. And if it make no peace with thee,...when the Lord hath delivered it into thy hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the sword." And we find an example in point, in the case of the Gibeonites, who, renouncing arms, attempted to gain by subtlety the most favourable terms; and when a treaty had been thus made with them unawares, the terms of the treaty were strictly respected, and the lives of the people spared.[1]

The destruction of the Canaanites exhibits to all nations, in all ages, a signal proof of God's displeasure against sin; it has been to others, and it is to ourselves, a benevolent warning. The conduct of Moses towards the Canaanites would have been open to severe animadversion, had he acted by his own authority alone: but it were as reasonable to attribute cruelty and murder to the judge of the land in condemning criminals to death, as to condemn the conduct of Moses in executing the command of God."

[1] Josh. ix. 3, 21. And thus the slow and gradual conquest of the country was, in the hands of Divine Providence, the means of effecting a greater good than would have resulted

CHAP. III.

We have now reached the time when Moses should receive a yet more formal and majestic installation into his office, when the dispensation committed to him should be expanded into larger proportions and more complete development, and the people be brought into nearer acquaintance with the God of their fathers, and under the more exact discipline of the law. This first year of their wanderings was therefore to be marked by an event more important in its consequences than any other, and from it were to date new trials, and a new state of probation to all this people. It was no longer with physical privations alone, nor with the dreariness of a desert march that they were to contend. They were now to pass under the yoke of a stricter spiritual discipline; it was to be proved [1] "what was in their hearts, whether they would keep God's commandments or no." Moses should be now the lawgiver, no less than the ruler and commander of the people. The promise that "he should serve God on this mountain" [2] was about to be verified, and the burning bush to be exchanged for the fiery mount. The Shepherd of Israel is summoned,

from an immediate extermination. For, (1.) it tried the obedience of Israel, Judg. ii. 21; (2.) it practised them in arms, Judg. iii. 1, 2; (3.) it prevented the country being overrun with wild beasts—those very scourges which are said to infest the country about Galilee at the present day. Ex. xxiii. 29, 30; Deut. vii. 22: "The LORD thy God will put out those nations before thee by little and little; thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee."

[1] Deut. viii. 2. [2] Ex. iii. 12.

amidst majestic sounds of the trumpet and the flashings of the thundercloud, to unearthly audiences; and that nothing should be wanting of due publicity and notoriety, it is commanded that the people also within duly prescribed limits, should come near to witness and to hear the solemn words from Heaven. Moses alone was to be admitted within limits which none else might transgress. He passes to and fro on the ministry of God's word to the people, who, against the third day, are to purify themselves, and then approach the boundary prescribed. Moses himself is to pass beyond, and to minister before the God of Heaven. The grandeur of the scene can scarce find fitter description than in the words of the sacred narrative itself. "And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice."[1] The law of the Ten Commandments is now promulged; but no sooner is it done, than the people, who from the first had trembled in great alarm, retreat hastily from the awful scene. And now, that fitting witnesses might still remain to attest the realities of the Divine

[1] Ex. xix. 17, 18, 19.

CHAP. III.

revelation, taking with him Aaron, with his two sons Nadab and Abihu, and seventy chosen elders of Israel[1], Moses reascends the mount, and leaving Joshua, his special minister on the occasion, at a few paces distance, he prepares himself again to receive the Heavenly voice. A six-days' cloud encompasses the mountain, and on the seventh day[2] the glory of the Lord shines out "as a devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel. . . . . And Moses was in the mount forty days and forty nights." The two tables of the law are here presented to him, "written with the finger of God" Himself;—by the dispensation, that is, of angelic ministries, or, as some suppose, by the second Divine Person in the blessed Trinity. The people, meanwhile, are to bring their matters before Aaron and Hur, till Moses should return to them. In his absence a fearful apostacy breaks out; an idolatrous image is set up, and divine honours paid to the likeness of a calf, the very animal set apart for sacrifice. This substitution of the heathen usages of Egypt for the pure worship of Jehovah, into which even

[1] Ex. xxiv. 1, 9, 13. The appointment of these Seventy Elders is regarded as the first origin of the Jewish Sanhedrim. In Num. xi. 16—25, we have the account of their first appointment. They were afterwards to merge in the great central court at Jerusalem, Deut. xvii. 9—11. "It is plain," says Bp. Patrick, "that these seventy persons made a higher court than any of those constituted by the advice of Jethro, and afterwards established in every city." See Ex. xviii. 12—27; Deut. xvi. 18.

[2] Ex. xxiv. 15—18.

Aaron fell, finds no apologist in Moses. Filled with grief and consternation, as the sound of the music and dancing and all the revelry of the idol feast fell upon his ear, he rushes from the mount, dashes the two tables of the covenant to the ground, and calls upon the congregation of Israel to give up the heads of the rebellion to the hands of justice. The Levites come forward and undertake the unwelcome duty of executing immediate vengeance upon no less than 3,000 of the chief offenders. It may be asked, why did Aaron escape? Why did he escape again on the occasion of himself and Miriam affecting equality with Moses, though Miriam was afflicted with leprosy in punishment for her fault? The Sacred history very clearly explains it in the latter case; and we have only to apply the same principle in the former. We shall then perceive that it was not from undue partiality, nor yet from regard to the sanctity of his office, that Aaron gained this exemption; but because of his prompt and sincere repentance, finding vent in the earnest cry, "I beseech thee lay not the sin upon us, wherein we have done foolishly, and wherein we have sinned." [1]

A similar defection of the people, when seduced, at the instigation of the wicked prophet Balaam, by the Moabitish women, we may just mention here; but it forms no part of our purpose to dwell minutely on the particulars of Balaam's history,

[1] Numb. xii. 11.

CHAP. III.

except so far as it illustrates the deep infection which still rested on the people, from their old idolatrous notions in Egypt, and shows the extreme difficulty of weaning them from their corrupt habits and ideas. We must not omit to observe—as both instances may well remind us to do—upon the remarkable and disinterested veracity of the Mosaic account. Josephus, in this part of his history, quite conceals the infirmity of Aaron, in being carried away by the popular idolatry in worshipping the golden calf; whereas Moses relates it with all its aggravations, and with no unworthy respect to the person of his own brother Aaron. And we find, generally, the same frankness and truth-telling disposition, marking every portion of his writings. He does, what no common writer, still less an impostor would do,—he freely owns the truth, though at the expense of his own reputation; and often suppresses the more favourable side, where it might tend to minister to personal exaltation. We hear nothing from himself of those various accomplishments which universal testimony ascribes to him,—nothing of the great sacrifice it must have cost him to renounce all the attractions of the court of Egypt, and to choose boldly the rough path of duty; but when it comes to matters of a less flattering nature, he tells us candidly, how he was tempted to err in the hastiness of his speech, and in his backwardness to accept the charge laid upon him; and how difficult he

found it to keep that charge, and to bring the people to any due degree of subordination and obedience to the will of God.

But what had been passing on the Mount during those forty days, when Moses was absent there? Besides the two tables of the Law, he had received exact directions for the framework of the tabernacle, the ark, and all the holy furniture,—the rules for the order of the priesthood, for the sacrifices and ceremonies of divine worship. The names of the artists, Bezaleel and Aholiab, were expressly revealed to him; but the patterns were to be taken from "heavenly things," displayed to him, doubtless, in mystic vision. From a passage in Deuteronomy, we may infer, that acts of intercession and prayer formed part of his employment on that sacred height. At least it was so, on the second occasion that he was called to that high communion with his Maker. After the sin of the people in the worship of the golden calf, we find him thus exercising his intercessory office. A second time he goes up into the Mount, and, rapt in holy vision for another forty days, he pleads with God in behalf of the guilty congregation. Two new Tables of the Law are granted to him, to replace those which in the fury of his zeal for God, he had broken in pieces on his former descent from the Mount.[1] "I fell down," says he, "before the Lord, as at the

[1] Ex. xxxiv. 1—4, 28; Deut. x. 1—4.

CHAP. III.

first—for forty days and forty nights: I did neither eat bread nor drink water, because of all your sins which ye sinned, in doing wickedly in the sight of the Lord, to provoke Him to anger."[1] And the Lord renewed to him that remarkable proclamation of Himself—as "The LORD, the LORD GOD, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth: keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and fourth generation."[2] On the expiration of this second period, and the renewal of God's covenant with his people, we read that, when Moses came down from Mount Sinai, "the skin of his face shone" with the reflected glory of the Divine presence; and "a vail was put on his face,"[3] that the people might be able to come near and address him.

In less than six months, the tabernacle, and all its furniture and sacred vessels, were completed. The time of the passover was again come round, and all seemed ready for the direct march to Canaan. On the second month of their second year's journey they are bid to set forward; and on reaching Kadesh Barnea, they send forward twelve men, a man from each tribe, to explore the land on which they hoped to enter. A new trial here awaits

[1] Deut. ix. 18, 25. [2] Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7. [3] Ex. xxxiv. 29—35.

Moses. The spies — though they returned with that famous cluster of grapes which required two men to carry it — brought no good report of the land. They represented it as full of cities, high, and walled up to heaven, and the inhabitants of warlike air and gigantic stature, before whom their hearts had sunk within them, and "they were in their own sight as grasshoppers." Joshua and Caleb alone, of all the spies, stood up for an immediate and courageous advance, in the name and in the strength of the Lord of Hosts. The advice of these faithful men was however in vain; and a retreat was determined on, which cost them the forty years' wandering in the wilderness which now ensued.[1] We have but the accounts of the first and last of these years, if we except the mere mention of some principal stages in the thirty-third chapter of Numbers.[2] No sooner had the Law been given, than some restless spirits ventured to innovate on some of what they regarded its superfluous ceremonies. Nadab and Abihu, the favoured sons of Aaron, who had been with Moses in the Mount, thus attempted to offer incense with strange fire on the altar; but for their offence "there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them, and they died before the Lord."[3] The like waywardness in Aaron and Miriam, in claiming equality with Moses, has been already mentioned, and was visited with proportionate severity. Punishment of death was

[1] Num. xiv. 33, 34. [2] See also Deut. x. 6. [3] Lev. x. 1, 2.

CHAP. III.

inflicted on a man who even picked up sticks on the Sabbath to burn. The most daring rebellion was that of Korah, a Levite, and his family, with Dathan, Abiram, and On, descendants of Reuben the first-born. These persuaded themselves that the distinctions of office, prescribed by the law, were unjust assumptions of Moses and Aaron, and they rose up against them, and drew off a large number of the congregation. The contest was decided by a direct appeal to Heaven : and on presenting themselves at the door of the Tabernacle to offer incense, as the priests alone might do, the impious band of Korah and their associates were scorched with fire from Heaven, while the earth opened and swallowed up Dathan and Abiram and all the unruly multitude who stood around their tents. Thus God avenged His own ordinances and vindicated the authority of His servant Moses. In sign of the special authority committed to the chosen High Priest, the rod of Aaron budded and blossomed in the tabernacle, those which belonged to the other heads of families in Israel remaining barren as before.

We may imagine, so meek as Moses was, with what pain he must have witnessed the just condemnation of these various offenders. Indeed, in some instances, the punishment may almost seem to have exceeded a due proportion to the offence. But in the beginning of institutions, it is necessary to exercise due and salutary discipline ; and laws,

which may afterwards admit of reasonable relaxation, must then be enforced with rigour. It is not every lie which is punished with the same severity as in the instance of Ananias and Sapphira, at a time when it was deemed peculiarly needful that "fear should come upon the infant churches." Theirs, however, was a moral and deadly sin; while the Israelites perished for violations of mere outward and ceremonial observances. There cannot be a doubt that Moses, in all these transactions, looked far beyond himself or any private ends. Had he paid regard to these, opportunities were not wanting to have promoted them at the expence of others. But this was never in his thoughts. He looked to the duties of his office, and to nothing else. When he witnessed the temporal sufferings which others, by their disobedience, brought down upon their own head, we may imagine him to have taken comfort in the reflection, that the temporal was not necessarily to be followed by eternal death; but that rather the justice of God might be satisfied in the present chastisement, and not extend to the final condemnation of the sinners in the world to come. The whole secret of his conduct was, in a word, the submission of himself to the known and revealed will of God. When exposed to contradictions and reproach, the answer was ever ready on his lips—"Who are we that ye murmur against us? your murmurings are against the Lord."[1]

[1] Ex. xvi. 7; Num. xvi. 11, and comp. Ex. iii. 11; iv. 10.

CHAP. III.

His conduct was thus marked with as much of meekness throughout, as of faithfulness to the commands of God.

He never loved his countrymen the less, because he feared and loved God the more. What can equal that noble burst of affection and ardent patriotism, when, in the midst of complaining that the burden of so great a multitude was too much for his single strength to bear (for that now "they were as the stars of heaven for multitude"), he thus apostrophises the same people, and says, "The Lord God of your fathers make you a thousand times so many more as ye are, and bless you, as He hath promised you!"[1] What disinterestedness, when, the Almighty having threatened to cut off and disinherit the whole people of Israel, and to make of Moses "a greater and mightier nation than they,"—the dazzling offer had no other effect upon him than to drive the holy Prophet to his knees, and to extort anew the intercessory prayer ever ready on his lips, "Pardon, I beseech Thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of Thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now!"[2] We might look in vain in heathen story for instances of the like absence of personal ambition and of private aims of aggrandisement, in stations of the same eminence and authority. The ardent love of others, the spirit of self-sacrifice, which had settled down,

[1] Deut. i. 10, 11. [2] Num. xiv. 12, 19.

in Moses, into a constant rule of life, seems a gift peculiar to the chosen servants of the Most High. The Scriptures supply another memorable instance in Christian times,—when St. Paul, a prisoner in chains, and pleading before Agrippa, in reply to the half-confession extorted from the King, ("almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian,") bursts out into that generous and noble strain, "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds." [1]

We must notice in one stage of their pilgrimage, the plague of serpents, of whose deadly bite a great multitude of the Israelites perished [2], when it pleased God to ordain a miraculous cure, the tradition of which has undoubtedly left its trace in many religious usages amongst the nations of the earth.[3] The peculiar import of the brazen serpent, which was on this occasion commanded to be made and raised up on a pole or ensign, that the Israelites looking towards it might receive a miraculous cure, we reserve for another occasion.[4] But to show how little it was intended as a mere natural charm, or to give countenance to the superstitious worship of outward signs, this very serpent of brass, after

[1] Acts, xxvi. 28, 29.

[2] Num. xxi. 8, 9; John, iii. 14.

[3] Thus the worship of Æsculapius, the god of physic, under the form of a serpent, may have been derived from a tradition of this event.—Kitto, *note* on Num. xxi. 9.

[4] The reader is referred to the longer note appended to this chapter.

CHAP. III.

being religiously kept among the Israelites for many ages, when it began to be abused to superstitious uses, was purposely destroyed by express command of God, in the reign of King Hezekiah.[1] The author of the Book of Wisdom has well pointed out the true virtue of the symbol, where he says, "He that turned himself towards it was not healed by the thing which he saw, but by Thee who art the Saviour of all."[2]

As the forty years' journey in the wilderness drew to an end, Moses redoubled his zeal and earnest care for the instruction and improvement of the people. He renews the covenant made with them at Horeb[3], and pledges them, on their arrival in Canaan, to engrave it on pillars or tablets of stone to be erected on Mount Ebal.[4] Clearing himself of all danger of mistake, he declares to them in emphatic terms, "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."[5] The generation was now fast dying out, to whom it had been threatened that they should not set foot in the promised land, because of their unbelief in being swayed by the ill report of the spies. The justice of this sentence we are not competent to call in question. It may, however, fairly and justly be demanded, if such was the sad

[1] 2 Kings, xviii. 4. [2] Wisd. xvi. 7. [3] Deut. xxix. xxx. [4] Deut. xxvii. 1—8. [5] Deut. xxx. 19.

condition of many for whom better things might have been hoped, where are we to look for the fruits of this great mission of Moses? The merits, it may be insisted, of any plan of government, or the abilities of the governor, may fairly be estimated by the amount of good produced, and by the success attending his measures. Where then was the good of this wilderness discipline? and what success had followed the past efforts of Moses? There can be no doubt, that in the knowledge of the true God, as distinct from the inventions of human superstition, a great progress had been made. "The great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians,"[1] had been enough to display the terrors of His arm. But in the wilderness they had learnt further His tender care for his people, how "He bare them as a man doth bear his son, in all the way that they went,"[2] and thus they had been taught the great duty and privilege of obedience, founded on *love*. And though many of them had failed to manifest that improvement under the various trials and dispensations appointed them, which might have been desired, there were still some faithful spirits who had realised the benefits intended. The old generation was dying out; but there were left those of younger years, who had really profited by the lessons they had received. At the age of twenty, men are not ill quali-

[1] Ex. xiv. 31. [2] Deut. i. 33.

CHAP. III.

fied to be wrought upon, by what they see and hear, to pay increasing heed to the lessons of Providence, and to turn to account the ripening experiences of life. Such must now have had the additional experience of another forty years,—time enough, one may be sure, to shake off the superstitious notions they had imbibed in Egypt, and to confirm themselves in the knowledge and obedience of the one true God of their fathers. To such, the many dispensations by which God had tried them, "to humble them and to prove them, to know what was in their hearts, whether they would keep his commandments or no,"[1] were not in vain; but they had effectually acquired the character that would fit them to take part with Joshua, in forming the first nucleus of the infant theocracy within the borders of the Holy Land.

Another thing which marks this period, is the fuller mention which is made to the Israelites of the natural beauties and advantages of the country before them: as though the nearer thoughts of it animated the speaker to dwell more upon this theme, than he had hitherto done on the dreary march through the wilderness. He no longer fears to contrast the fertile plains of Canaan with the barren rocks of Paran. He dwells with rapture on the good land of promise—as "a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths, that spring out of valleys and hills;—a land of wheat, and barley,

[1] Deut. viii. 2.

and vines, and figtrees, and pomegranates; a land of oil-olive and honey."[1] Yet to these happier scenes, neither Aaron, nor himself, in their own persons, are ever destined to arrive. Both are to be monuments of the impartiality of Divine justice, because of their offences; and are to forfeit the fondly hoped privilege of admission to the Promised Land. The exact nature of the offence of Moses may admit of some doubt; but, whatever it was, Aaron participated in it[2]; and we have the authority of the Psalmist for saying, that "he spake unadvisedly with his lips."[2] According to a tradition of the Rabbis, the act consisted in the opprobrious appellation by which he had addressed his countrymen, when he struck the rock to give them water. We shall see reason for regarding it in a somewhat different light. But it may be well to give the passage at full length. The people having for the second time given vent to some vehement expression of complaint, on occasion of their wanting water, Moses, we read, receives commandment, saying, "Take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou, and Aaron thy brother, and speak ye unto the rock before their eyes; and it shall give forth his water, and thou shalt bring to them water out of the rock. And Moses took the rod from before the Lord, as He commanded him....And Moses and Aaron gathered

[1] Deut. viii. 7, 8. [2] Ps. cvi. 33.

CHAP. III.

the congregation together before the rock, and he said unto them, Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice; and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank thereof, and their beasts also."[1] Such were the exact circumstances of the case. But what was the charge founded upon them? We find it in chapter xxxii. verse 51: —"Because ye trespassed *against Me* among the children of Israel, at the waters of Meribah-Kadesh; because ye *sanctified me not* in the midst of the children of Israel." From which it would appear, that this act of Moses in twice smiting the rock, was an overlooking of the express word of the Divine command, in the indulgence of a hasty and impatient temper, or of some feeling of personal vanity. It was a mistaken idea of improving on the prescribed methods of God, — as if it was either the word of man, the blow, or the twice repeating[2] of the blow, that would produce the effect,—and not rather the invisible power of God, and His blessing on the faithful performance of His word. That God, in His infinite wisdom, had some further design[3] in not permitting the rock to be

[1] Num. xx. 8—12.

[2] "Twice," as it might have seemed, in appropriate signification of the twice-repeated complaining of the people.

[3] That class of precepts which is called *positive*, as not founded on any obvious principles of reason and morality, must often have been a stumbling-block to the

struck as on a former occasion, we doubt not; and especially this, that it might better symbolise the rock's great Antitype, who was to suffer once, and once only, under the stroke of the law, for the sins of the world.

Aaron dies first, on Mount Hor, and was buried. With Moses, there is a larger interval of warning and preparation, though we know not exactly how long. In an early chapter of Deuteronomy, he mentions his approaching end, but reverts to it no more till the end of the book. As he contemplated his own removal, he seems to have made it his first care to provide a faithful successor, who might tend the flock which he was about to quit, and lead them safely forward to the consummation of their hopes. Committing this desire of his heart in prayer to God, he is directed to make choice of Joshua, whom he is to bring to the Holy Tabernacle,—the seat of the Divine presence,—and there to induct him into his office. To this kindly forethought for his people, Moses, under the Divine direction, shortly adds another labour of love, in the composition of that beautiful song, which, though it must necessarily lose something of the charm of its poetic dress and melody to the modern reader, is still full of the most sublime and heart-stirring strains, and was eminently calculated then,

faith of men under the Jewish dispensation. It is comparatively easy now to look back and trace their application to the times of Messiah.

CHAP. III.

by its mention of so many points in their national history, to make a deep and abiding impression on the minds of the Israelitish people. What sublime and impressive passages are these!—"He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; He surrounded him, He instructed him, He kept him as the apple of His eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings; so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him." (Deut. xxxii. 10–12.) "See now, that it is I, even I, and there is no god with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. For I lift up my hand to heaven,—I say, I live for ever. If I whet the lightning of my sword, and mine hand take hold on judgment, I will render vengeance to mine adversaries, and will repay them that hate me." (Deut. xxxii. 39–42.)

Such are the last preparations before the great Lawgiver must quit his charge. And now he, too, must obey his summons from the God of the spirits of all flesh. "Get thee up into this mountain, and die, and be gathered unto thy people." Such is the word of God to him on the selfsame day, "that he had rehearsed all the words" of that last song in the ears of all the congregation. How often of old had he paced the mountain-top, seeking there—in the retirement of Nature's sanctuary, half-lifted

as it were to heaven, or in immediate intercourse with Nature's God — rest to his weary spirit, recruited strength for fresh labours, counsel and direction for his future path! Shall his God forsake him at the last? Shall there be no more blessing for him on the mountain-top? Yes! there again God meets him, and appears to him. "His eye is not dim, nor his natural force abated," but, apart from this natural vigour, God strengthens him by His Spirit. By a miraculous extent of view there is spread out before him the whole extent of Canaan. Nor is the vision bounded there;—but as he looks abroad from Mount Nebo,—across the intervening stream of Jordan and the plains of Moab, to the valley of Jericho, to Kedron, and to Hebron, and the brook of Siloah on the south,—and as he stretches his view northward to the plains of Sharon, and over Mount Carmel to the more distant Lebanon and the everlasting hills; so, doubtless, to the eye of his faith was disclosed that further stage of things, to which Jerusalem itself, and her temple, and all the scenes of Palestine were but the curtain and the veil. And thus forecasting the kingdom of the Messiah and the better days to come, and the rest that remaineth for the people of God, this great Prophet dies and resigns his spirit to Him who gave it. We read of no instructions being given by him, as once by Joseph, to take up his bones and bury them in the land of his fathers. Nor were other tokens wanting to show that his body

CHAP. III.

was designedly to be left in an unknown place, lest in after ages it should be made the object of adoration[1] among a people predisposed to idolatry by what they had seen practised in Egypt. In some unknown spot it was deposited, and awaits the resurrection of the just. Josephus speaks of "his body not being found, and disappearing."[2] According to a current tradition of the Jews, "he ascended and ministered to God in the heavens." The scene of the Transfiguration related by the first three Evangelists, where he appears in company with Elias, has inclined many to adopt a very similar idea of his translation to heaven, after the manner of that other Prophet. But, as the Scripture account makes mention of his death and burial, and as the Apostle Jude speaks of a contest in the spiritual world over the "body of Moses," we may rather believe that he was associated with Elias, on the occasion referred to, in vision, not in reality; or

[1] This very reason we have in *R. Levi Ben Gershom.* "Future generations," says he, "might perhaps have made a god of him, because of the fame of his miracles; for do we not see how some of the Israelites erred in the brazen serpent which Moses made? And what then would they not have done, had they but known where his remains were laid?" "For this reason, very likely, it was that, how much soever Moses was in love with Canaan, he did not desire to be carried thither to be buried with his ancestors, as Joseph did; because his interment in that country might have proved of dangerous consequence, if, in their distress, the children of Israel should have run to his sepulchre, and begged of him to pray for them, whose prayers and intercession in their behalf they had found in his lifetime so very prevalent."—Patrick *on Deut.* xxxiv. 6.

[2] *Antiq.*, lib. iv. c. viii.

else that his real body was raised purposely for that occasion. And we cannot do better than adhere to the express language of the sacred narrative, "So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And He buried him" (by the hand of angels, as it would appear from Jude) "in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."[1] We have here sought to lay another stone to his memory, and to bring out the strong features of his character, and his claims to be considered the inspired Prophet of Heaven. We have regarded him, perhaps, a little too exclusively, in his great public capacity as Leader and Governor of Israel,—passing over in comparative silence the interior, as it were, of his life and manners,—and have said nothing of his symbolical office as typifying the future Deliverer of the world, that "greater Prophet which was yet to be raised up in Israel like unto him," and to whom they should "hearken;"[2] but, if they refused, "every soul which will not hear him, was to be destroyed from among the people." For, however worthy of notice in themselves these points may be (and most deserving of attention they are), it seemed better to keep them separate from the thread of the narrative, and to confine ourselves to those principal circumstances of his life, on which

[1] Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6.

[2] Compare the parallel expression, "hear Him,"—Matt. xvii. 5; Mark, ix. 7; Luke, ix. 35.

CHAP. III.

after all the others must depend. For the same reason we must leave to others the discussion of the spirit and temper of those laws[1] which were delivered by him, and which were the great foundation, not of the Jewish code alone, but also, as is probable, of that of every other civilised nation in the world. We subjoin a brief mention of the more striking particulars, in which the history of Moses was typical of the great Messiah that was to come into the world.

Moses, a type of Christ. — Interesting as is the life of the great Jewish Lawgiver, regarding him only as we have hitherto done, in his individual capacity, and as the chosen leader of Israel; it acquires additional interest when we consider him, further, as the forerunner of a better dispensation to come. Any view of his character must be incomplete, which omits to regard him in this ulterior light. If he was a shining light to the men of that generation, — if he displayed abilities and virtues of the highest order, and exhibited the most exemplary fidelity in his office,—with all these excellencies was combined the still higher office of representing, however faintly, a greater Prophet to come; and whose more exceeding glory should one day scatter the clouds of Sinai, before the brightness of His appearing. We had before occasion to remark on the peculiarly Catholic nature, in many instances, of the scenes and transactions in which Moses took part; and how the desert, and the wandering, and the Red Sea, and the pillar of the cloud, the manna and the rock, and many such things, have their counterpart in the blessings and the realities of the Christian covenant. We might have added to the catalogue many rites

[1] On the purity and excellence of the Mosaic Law, see especially Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* lib. vii.—ix. and xiv. xv.; Graves, *On the Pentateuch*, Pt. II. and Pt. III. Lect. iii.; Warburton, *Divine Legation of Moses;* Hamilton, *On the Pentateuch;* Currey, *Hulsean Lectures.*

and ceremonies of the law, and institutions of the temple service. But the analogy between any of these, and the benefits which, as Christians, we have now received, is not more striking than that which subsists between the personal office and character of Moses himself, and the person of Him that was to come.

1. — Take him first in the character of a *Prophet.* In the terms which accompanied the giving of the law, — in the near communion which he was permitted to hold with Heaven, while every other witness of the sight shrunk back with horror and alarm, — in the continuance of that high communion, till his very countenance was radiant with the heavenly glory, — in the wonders which made him "very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people" (Exod. xi. 3), — in the comprehensive yet distinctive character of that celebrated code, which, in the name of the Almighty, he was commissioned to promulgate from Mount Sinai; — in all these singular prerogatives, where was ever the Prophet that might compare with Moses? — a Prophet, as the Scriptures express it, "whom the Lord knew face to face, in all the signs and the wonders which the Lord sent him to do to Pharaoh and to all his land. And in all that mighty hand, and in all the great terror, which Moses showed in the sight of all Israel." (Deut. xxxiv. 10—12.) But there yet remains an important feature of his *prophetic* office, and one in which he still more closely resembles Christ, viz., the power of foretelling future events. He not only describes beforehand the Promised Land with all the vividness and particularity of one who had actually seen and lived in it; but he marks out the future destiny of its old inhabitants, and the still more varied destinies of the people who were about to dispossess them, and to occupy the land in their stead. In a subsequent chapter we shall be able to point out instances of that most singular discernment, by which he was permitted to penetrate into the future settlement of nations, and mark the course and direction of civilisation and religion. Add to this, the direct prophecies of the Messiah, with which his writings abound. These, too, will be found noticed at some length in the last-named chapter. They none of them exceed in distinctness and importance that celebrated one in Deut. xviii. 15—18: "A Prophet will the Lord thy God raise up unto thee of thy brethren, like unto me: unto

CHAP. III.

him shall ye hearken." And accordingly we find this prophecy very frequently urged in later times by the Apostles, as in Acts iii. 22, 23; vii. 37.

2. — The office of *Lawgiver* was another plain characteristic of Moses; and so it was of Christ. The sermon on the mount is enough to show the authority which He took upon Him to give laws to His people. A learned writer has well remarked: "Search the whole range of inspired Prophets; view that long line of eminent men, distinguished by various gifts of inspiration, having diversities of gifts from the same Holy Spirit; some endued with the power of working miracles, healing the sick, and raising the dead; some enabled, with the glance of their mental vision, to pierce the gloom of futurity, and depict with the boldest, yet most accurate imagery, events yet distant: seek out Joshua, the chosen captain of Israel; Samuel, called to consecrate her kings; David, himself the anointed of the Lord; Elijah, a man of like passions with ourselves, but gifted with Divine wisdom in his life, and distinguished in his death, above the sons of men; and Elisha, upon whom the spirit of Elijah rested; contemplate those twelve holy men who declared all the will of the Lord, until vision and prophecy were sealed up: and behold all these enforcing, with all the authority of their office, and in the name of the Most High God, the sanctions of the Mosaic law, and often giving intimations of some greater lawgiver, who should be raised up; yet in no one instance themselves introducing any new law. Behold the world left for a series of years in darkness, uncheered by one ray of inspiration, until at length the gospel day begins to dawn; the Spirit begins to be poured out upon all flesh; the prophetic dreams, the vision, and the superhuman voice, are once more displayed among the people of Israel; the messenger comes in the wilderness, to prepare the way of the Lord; and then the long-predicted, and typified, and expected Prophet appears, like unto Moses in many respects, and delivering laws, as Moses did, with authority and power."— Chevallier, *Hulsean Lectures.* Camb. 1826.

3, 4. — As a *Priest* and as a *King* Moses was, further, a fit representative of Christ: if not in the same degree as in his other offices of *lawgiver* and *prophet*, yet sufficiently so to ensure that which is more striking than any mere single point of re-

semblance, viz., the wonderful combination of characters, which never before or since met in the same individual. Moses was not himself a priest; yet, receiving his appointment anterior to Aaron, he had to perform the priestly office on more than one occasion, as the patriarchs had done before him. On one of these occasions, he so exactly typified Christ, that the very words which he was directed to employ were engrafted upon the first institution of the most solemn ordinance of the Christian Church. For "he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, *Behold the blood of the covenant*, which the Lord hath made with you, concerning all these words" (Exod. xxiv. 7, 8); recalling to mind the very similar expression in the Gospels, — "He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my *blood of the New Testament*" (i. e. *Covenant*), "which is shed for many, for the remission of sins" (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28). Whether the passage, Deut. xxxiii. 5, "he was king in Jeshurun," may be referable to Moses, or whether Jehovah Himself be intended, it is clear that Moses was *in fact* a king, as much as if he had been expressly called by that name. The kings of later times were themselves but instruments under God to execute His commands, as supreme Governor of the people, manifesting that government by outward and visible tokens: and Moses in this light was not inferior to them. In the substance of his office, he precisely resembled *them;* — and therefore, both as priest and king, we may view him as typifying and preparing the way for the future Redeemer, no less than as a prophet he resembled Him in the plenitude of the gifts by which he was distinguished.

5.—We pass to the last great point of resemblance—one evidently in the mind of the Apostle, when he speaks of the law having been "ordained by angels in the hand of a MEDIATOR" (Gal. iii. 19), and one most strictly in harmony with the evangelical dispensation. How often we may observe him in the exercise of this mediatorial character! When the people were in great terror and consternation before the awful thunders of Sinai, amid the "blackness, and darkness, and tempest,"—when they were unable to bear so terrible a sight, standing though they

CHAP. III.

might within the prescribed limits of the Mount,—Moses alone was able to draw near to converse with God. And the people said unto Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die. And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was." (Exod. xx. 19—21.) To this occasion it was that Moses refers the first announcement of that remarkable prophecy on which we have already dwelt. It was when the people shrunk from the glories which indicated the miraculous presence of Jehovah, and wished for a Mediator to interpose between them (Deut. xvii. 16), that the word went forth, "They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee." (Deut. xvii. 18.) Thus might he say, "I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord." (Deut. v. 5.) In the same capacity we find him, at other times, interceding for the people. When they fell into that grievous sin, the worship of the golden calf,—when, again, they had sinned, in the matter of the spies, and God threatened to disinherit and cast them off,—when they provoked God by the waters of Meribah,—and on many similar occasions, with what fervour he implores the Divine forgiveness! We find him rather disposed to implicate and mix up himself in the whims and infirmities of the people for whom he acted, than neglect the mediatorial part which he had undertaken to perform toward them. Under the tempting offer, "I will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they" (Numb. xiv. 12), he seems to spurn every thought but that of making common cause with the people, and in the largeness of a sympathising heart, he vents himself in still more earnest prayer, "Pardon, I beseech Thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of Thy mercy, and as Thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt even until now." (Numb. xiv. 19.) In prayers such as this, we are even informed, that the time was in great measure spent, when, rapt in holy vision on the Mount, he held mysterious converse with Heaven. "I fell down," he tells us, "before the Lord, as at the first, forty days and forty nights; I neither did eat bread nor drink water, because of all your sins which ye sinned, in doing wickedly in the sight of the Lord, to provoke Him to anger . . . I prayed, therefore, unto the Lord, and

said, O, Lord God, destroy not Thy people and thine inheritance, which Thou hast redeemed through Thy greatness, which Thou hast brought forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand." (Deut. ix. 18, 26.) Could anything more justly denominate him a fit type of Him who interposed between the offended justice of God and the trembling offender? Could any outward situation have prepared, in a more emphatic manner, that office of the greater Prophet, on which all our hopes of acceptance depend? Could anything more sensibly place before our eyes the "One God, and the One Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus?" (1 Tim. ii. 5.)

6. — There were inferior resemblances, on which we need not particularly dwell: such as the miraculous escape from the slaughter of the infants, and the return from Egypt; the forty days' fast; the refusal of the offer of the kingdoms of this world; the rejection by his own countrymen; the frequent murmuring of his followers; the giving of manna; the smiting of the rock; the lifting up of the brazen serpent in the wilderness; the shining of his countenance; the dying in the full vigour of his strength; and (if it was so) the miraculous translation of his body to heaven.

Of these, the lifting up the serpent in the wilderness is alluded to by our Lord Himself, in illustration of the mode of His own appointed death. In His "lifting up" of Himself He was to resemble—not indeed the serpent, whom (in a figure) He came to overcome—but Moses, who lifted up that serpent. "This brazen serpent put upon a pole," says Bishop Patrick, "was not a figure of Christ; but of the old serpent himself (the devil), as wounded, bruised, and dead, by the lifting up of Christ on the cross, where He entirely disarmed him of all his power to hurt us." (Vide Patrick, *note*, *Numbers* xxi. 9.)

Such was the vividness of the type, through all its points of resemblance; and such the exactness of the fulfilment. What proof is there in all this—not merely of the supernatural character of the Mosaic economy, but also of the visible manifestation of the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, who connects, in His all-seeing eye, the faintest shadow cast before with the actual event, which, according to appointed order and in the fulness of time, comes behind!

CHAP. IV.

The Dispersion.

Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς Σὴμ, καὶ ἔσται Χαναὰν παῖς αὐτοῦ· πλατύναι Κύριος τῷ Ἰάφεθ, καὶ κατοικησάτω ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις Σήμ· κ.τ.λ. Καὶ ὅτι οὑτῶ γέγονεν ἀκούσατε· ὑμεῖς γὰρ (Ἰουδαῖοι) οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σὴμ κατάγοντες τὸ γένος, ἐπήλθετε, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλὴν, τῇ γῇ τῶν υἱῶν Χαναὰν, καὶ διακατέσχετε αὐτήν· καὶ ὅτι οἱ υἱοι Ἰάφεθ, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ κρισὶν ἐπέλθοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑμῖν, ἀφείλοντο ὑμῶν τὴν γῆν καὶ διακατέσχον αὐτὴν φαίνεται.—Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.*

"I do not know any better cure of (speculative) Atheism, next to the grace of God, than the due consideration of the Origination of Mankind."—Sir Matthew Hale.

CHAP. IV.

The naturalist who is desirous of comprehending clearly his department of science, begins by arranging the varieties of species under their genera, — these again under families, orders, classes, — till he has reached the limit which marks a separate province in the animal or vegetable kingdom. When this is done, and the results of his researches duly registered, suppose a book were found, coming down from some remote antiquity, and containing an exact catalogue of the very types and forms to which the parentage of the several varieties had been thus carefully traced, — would not the coincidence be considered a remarkable one? Would not much curiosity be excited about the author of

such a book? Would not much credit be given him for the singular skill and insight he had thus early discovered into so deep and complicated a subject? Would he not at once have accorded to him the first rank among writers in his branch of science? But Moses, in his relation of the first origin of *nations*, goes far beyond this. He traces to one blood all nations of the earth; and, as though this were an easy task, he proceeds further to distinguish the several families of man, as they arise, under three distinctive heads,—as though he foresaw the very localities which would become most celebrated on the map of the world, and wished to denominate them, from the commencement, after their true original. We may almost fancy him to have had in view the three great continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa, together with what we may include under the generic Hebrew term the 'Isles of the Sea,' viz. the Western Hemisphere itself, when he wrote an account so suggestive of times and of people yet to come. Nay,—could we for a moment forget the remarkable character of the man, and the preternatural assistances which he received, we might even be tempted to think that he must have written *after* those great geographical divisions had been established, and the infant tribes had been developed into full-grown national communities. If he had been taking a quiet survey, in the palmy days of Augustan literature, over all the known countries of the

CHAP. IV.

world, and their several histories; and if he had kept a memorandum of the principal localities that had occupied his attention in the course of such a survey, he could hardly have made a better selection than he has actually done under very different circumstances, and writing, as he did, some 1000 years before that period; though even then he came long before the earliest known writers of history.

So far as we know, there is but one exception to this remark, and that regards the Chinese; of which people, it may be said, we find no trace, not even the remotest mention, in Genesis. To account for this, it has been supposed by some, that China might have been the country where the ark rested, and the first settlements were made by the immediate descendants of Noah; and that, therefore, they were less careful to note down home events, as we may call them—*i.e.* events concerning themselves;—while those which took place to the right or left of the primitive settlements, and of which it might otherwise have been difficult to preserve the records, found their appropriate annalists. But this theory seems opposed to the usual practice of nations, which undoubtedly is, to preserve their own records first. Nor can it be conceded, that the ark ever drifted so far north as China, so as to make it answer to such a supposed primitive antiquity. We must, therefore, rather ascribe the apparent silence of Moses to our own ignorance of

the true origin and early history of that singular people. According to *Sir William Jones*, the Chinese have no traditions beyond the 12th century before Christ. And even if they had existed nationally at an earlier period, our knowledge of them to the present day is so imperfect, that it would be the height of injustice and absurdity, to blame the Mosaic history with defects which may be owing to our own ignorance and want of information.[1]

[1] That offshoot of the family of Ham which, commencing with Nimrod, and striking off to the north-east of Asia, retained its original warlike and predatory character, seems to have been the element of the great *Mongolian* branch of ethnographers. If so, it was a tribe of this branch which, extending itself over the fertile plains of *China*, took up a new taste for agricultural and peaceful pursuits, to which indeed that country must have powerfully invited them. For it is to the *Mongolian* type that the Chinese evidently belong.

In affinity with the same we may place the population which spread northward, and ultimately overflowed into the arctic regions, across the narrow strait which separates the Old World from the New, and so became the root-people of *America*. Thus, the high cheek-bone, pyramidal form of the head, eyes wide apart and elevated at the outer corners,—which distinguish the Mongolian, are found in the Esquimaux; and so downwards through all the native Indian tribes of America. The Aztecs, or Mexicans, are not of course included in the same general law with the native Indian races; but like the present lords of the soil in the States of North America and in other parts of that vast continent, they are supposed to be a race of foreigners of superior stamp, and boasting from the first a higher order of civilisation. But with respect to the indigenous races, though the face of an Indian chief has some advantages, the rest have generally the type of countenance which bespeaks them to be allied to the races of north-eastern Asia. A keen observer of natural history remarks: "In the South American Indian all these defects are still more exaggerated, and give to the races of the South a very marked character of inferiority. At the extreme point of the continent, and in Tierra del Fuego, live the Pesherais, the most mis-

CHAP. IV.

Passing, then, from this, and proceeding with those other people, of which Moses particularly speaks, we find that names are given us of certain immediate descendants of Noah, and their families, till we come down by gentle stages to the known periods of history, as recorded in other sources. But it is by Moses alone that we are guided back to the first link in the series. It is obvious to remark what peculiar advantages and opportunities he must have enjoyed for a work of this kind. He was living, according to the Hebrew chronology, not more than 800 years from the flood—or if we take the longest computation, that of Josephus and the Septuagint, it was not above 1,500 years;—a less period than that which divides us at the present time from the days of the Roman Empire. But this is not all. There were sixteen successions from Noah to Moses; but, owing to the much

shapen, the most uncultivated, and the most wretched of all the inhabitants of the New World. It is the same in advancing towards the poles. Passing the Fins, we arrive at the Laplanders; through the Mongolians we reach the Tungusians, the Samoiedes of Siberia, and the Esquimaux of North America. Thus, in all directions, in proportion as we remove from the geographical seat of the [original and] most beautiful human type, the degeneration becomes more marked. Does not this surprising coincidence seem to designate the Caucasian regions as the cradle of man, the original point of departure for the tribes of the earth?"—Guyot's *Earth and Man*, ch. xvi. If the ark rested on the mountains of Armenia, this would well enough accord with the latter hypothesis; to say nothing of the many other indications in the early Scripture history which would point us to that whole range of country between the steeps of Caucasus and the Arabian Gulf, as the probable cradle of civilisation before and after the Flood.

greater longevity of that time, there were, in all these generations, but four[1] steps through which the tradition would have had to come, from mouth to mouth,—viz., Kohath, Jacob, Abraham, and Shem, in order to reach Moses through his father Amram. And when we consider the care with which the Hebrews were wont to preserve the archives of their national history, it is easy to see to what satisfactory sources of information Moses had access, regarded only as a common writer. But we know that the Scriptures claim for him a much higher authority than this. And considering the disposition sometimes manifested to lower that authority, and to dethrone him, as it were, from the high position hitherto assigned him by the faith of the Christian Church, we are prepared to vindicate that position, and to establish, as far as we can from the premises before us, the evident tokens in the portion of his writings now under review, of a superior insight into coming events;—how, in a small space, he has laid the foundation of all future history;—how he has supplied a link which connects and reconciles its known and later portions with what we are taught to believe of man's original destination. We think no instance too small, which

[1] Shem, who was an eyewitness of the Flood, was contemporary with Abraham, Abraham contemporary with Jacob, Kohath, the son of Levi, contemporary with Jacob, and Amram, the father of Moses, with Kohath: whence the tradition of the Flood would pass to Moses through four hands, viz. Shem to Abraham, Abraham to Jacob, Jacob to Kohath, Kohath to Amram.

CHAP. IV.

may serve to supply something in confirmation of those higher pretensions which we advocate as fairly belonging to Moses. And many such instances we think we have in this relation of the dispersion of nations. Written with no apparent design of displaying superior intelligence, it so completely harmonises with known and later events,—it so completely comprises in few elements, the very germ of all coming history,—that we can scarcely observe such admirable perfection in its kind, in so early a document, without suspecting some supernatural aid. And while some contend, that Genesis deals only with the history of the chosen people, and that the meaning of the book is exhausted in its application to that one people, we shall be rather led to conclude that it has a far wider object, and an universal bearing upon all mankind; and that through and beyond, as it were, the portals of Judaism, it embraces within its precincts the interests of all the other nations of the world. Moses himself speaks expressly (Genesis x. 5) of the first peopling of "the isles of the *Gentiles;*" and if there were no other proof, this alone would serve to show that he was not limited in his object to the people of the Hebrews; it would be an authority to us to apply his relation as widely as it will bear; as widely, indeed, as to comprehend the whole civilised world. And for this, we doubt not, there was given him more than the advantages of a comparatively recent tradition.

or of access to authentic documents. We cannot think that he stumbled by chance on that skilful selection of names which have so often reproduced themselves under various forms in the annals of nations, and have obtained a world-wide celebrity, not from their occurring in Genesis only, but because they belong to history. The more we study this portion of the sacred narrative, the more we shall be impressed with the conviction that it could have proceeded from no ordinary hand, but from a man raised up for an extraordinary purpose, by the special Providence of God.

For the further elucidation of the argument, it will be necessary to enter a little on the actual history of some of the principal races, as they have figured on the stage of the civilised world ;—connecting them afterwards with the three sons of Noah, "of them the whole earth was overspread." (Gen. ix. 19.)

1. First in order, let us take the line of *Shem*. With Abraham we may, perhaps, begin the clear history of this people. A period of 430 years brings us from the birth of Isaac to the arrival out of Egypt into the promised land — an important epoch, during which they had experienced every variety of fortune, and had begun to be known as a distinct people. They settle in Canaan; and the land is divided among the twelve tribes. Though they have no king, they are under the direct government of the Almighty, and of

CHAP. IV.

rulers sent by Him till the time of Saul. Another 400 years had now elapsed, and their prosperity reached its climax under David, successor of Saul, and Solomon his son. The division of the kingdom ensued, and the national prosperity began to decline. The Babylonish captivity completed its fall. The line of their kings, however, survived in Zerubbabel, who rebuilt the temple. Ezra restored the laws, and Nehemiah the walls of Jerusalem. With Cyrus began the Persian rule over Judæa: from the Persians it passed to the Grecians, and thence to the Romans. Under all these, the Jews retained the appointment of their own Chief Priests, who had a kind of princely authority among them. As a nation, and excepting their share in the inconveniences to which they were exposed in the wars between Syria and Egypt, they were on the whole well treated by their conquerors, till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 169—166, who grievously oppressed them, and shamefully profaned their temple and city. From this oppression they were delivered by Judas Maccabeus. The Maccabees continued in power till Herod. And shortly after our Saviour was born in Bethlehem, the country was divided among the three sons of Herod. But disorders so often broke out that, A.D. 12, it was determined by the Emperor Augustus to take the government out of the hands of the Jewish people; and a Roman, Coponius by name, was made Procurator (or

deputy-governor) of Judæa, under Quirinus, President of Syria. The taxing of it as a Roman province completed their degradation, and accounts for the extreme horror with which they regarded the Romans, to whom they were thus made to own their complete subjection. Hitherto they had not been without some independent governor of their own, mostly resident at Jerusalem. Now the only governor was a Roman, and he lived at Cæsarea, in Galilee.

Comparing this outline of Jewish history with the Mosaic notices of the people that should come in contact with the line of Shem, — we find in the book of Genesis some first traces of the Persians, or Elamites (according to their Hebrew appellation), in "Elam;" of the Hebrews themselves in "Eber;" of the Assyrians in "Asshur;" of the Babylonians in "Babel;" of the Greeks and Romans in "Elishah" (identified by Dr. Kalisch with Hellas and Elis) and in the ships of "Chittim." But more than this: we find the line of Shem peculiarly distinguished by being made the subject of several distinct prophecies; we find it standing in a kind of galaxy of predictions, which, though scattered here and there in the Pentateuch, yet collectively throw a most conspicuous lustre on the subject of them. We might here adduce all that is predicted of the several tribes[1]; but that most striking prediction of the tribe of Judah may suffice: "The sceptre shall not

[1] Gen. xlviii. xlix; Deut. xxxiii.

CHAP. IV.

depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to Him shall the gathering of the people be." Add the prophecy of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17, 24), "And there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Seth. . . . And ships shall come from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever;"[1] and the still earlier declaration (Gen. ix. 26, 27), "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." And, to end this account, those directly Messianic predictions may be cited, which we find delivered in the books of Moses: such especially as that twice repeated (Deut. xviii.

[1] Gen. xlix. 10. The foregoing summary of Jewish history is sufficient to show the exact fulfilment of this prophecy, delivered 1700 years before! If it be objected, that the sceptre had already departed from Judah before the birth of our Saviour, and that Zedekiah was the last king, B. C. 610;—we reply: The sovereignty of the kings did indeed cease with Zedekiah, but not the supremacy of Judah among the tribes, which is the thing here immediately spoken of. Moreover the government remained, and in a great measure independent, in the hands of the Jews themselves, and the seat of it was at Jerusalem, in the tribe of Judah, till the end of the reign of Archelaus, A. D. 12, when the first Roman procurator was appointed, as we have seen above. The stress in the prophecy is not on the word "sceptre," but, after the Hebrew fashion, the latter clause of the verse explains and qualifies the former. The verse is thus explained by Bp. Patrick: "There shall be either kings or inferior governors among the Jews till Christ come." Judah included Benjamin and Levi, who were incorporated with it.

15, 18, 19): "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. . . . And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Immediately connected with which are the express threatenings of the downfall of the people, because of their unbelief (Lev. xxvi.; Deut. xxviii.): some passages referring to the time of the first temple, and to the Assyrian and Babylonish captivities[1]: others to the return from Babylon, and the final destruction of the temple by the Romans.[2] These prophecies, though it may not be easy to arrange them in precise periods of time, suffer nothing by comparison with others delivered much nearer the events by subsequent prophets. The sky was not yet overcast; but the first rumbling of the thunder is heard, which swells up and gathers strength in the pages of sacred writ, till the "days of vengeance" were fully come, and the predicted ruin fell down on the chosen seed, to be reversed only when they turn effectually and (it is to be hoped) finally to Him that smites them. The history of the line of Shem has more or less touched upon that of the other families of the sons of Noah. We will now take them separately, and

[1] Deut. xxviii. 20—49 are thus usually understood.
[2] So Deut. xxviii. 49—56.

CHAP IV.

2. Next, the family of *Ham*. We may take Egypt as the principal representative of this branch; although, from the very early settlement of that country, and from the successive importations which it received, it contained a very strong infusion of the other races. The first King of Egypt, mentioned by Herodotus, and famous in all Egyptian annals, was Menes. He was the reputed founder of Memphis, which afterwards became the capital city of all Egypt. In those early times, the constitution of the country was rather a confederation of separate νόμαι, or petty states, than one large[1] kingdom—a condition somewhat resembling the confederation of kingdoms and duchies in modern times, under the German Empire. It is now admitted on all hands, that in the first eighteen dynasties of Manetho, the names on his lists were for the most part those of contemporary, not of successive kings. Attempts at consolidation were now and then made, but without appreciable result, till the kingdoms were united under Osirtasen I., "Lord of the Upper and Lower Country," as his style

[1] "Kingdoms," observes Sir John Stoddart, "in those days were often of very limited extent. A few years after his short sojourn in Egypt, Abraham, with only "three hundred and eighteen trained servants," defeated four "kings" who had previously overcome five other "kings." Gen. xiv. 8—16.—*Introduction to Universal History*, part ii. p. 150.

"Kings" of Canaan occur in the Book of Judges, with little more than a few fenced cities for their territory. *Adoni-bezek*, king of Bezek, boasted that seventy "kings" had gathered bread under his table. Judg. i. 7.

runs on the monuments. This was during the XIIth dynasty: but the final union and consolidation was not till the XVIIIth, and after the successful expulsion of the Hycsos, or shepherd-kings, under Amosis. That remarkable race appear to have invaded Egypt from the north-east—or from part of Arabia; and held it in partial subjection—that is, chiefly the country of Lower Egypt—for upwards of 500 years. These Arab kings had been great persecutors of the Egyptian religion, and are supposed to have inculcated the worship of the Sun, to the exclusion of the multitude of nature-gods with which Egypt abounded. It is thought that Joseph was sold into Egypt about[1]

[1] So Dr. Hales. Bp. Cumberland makes it 96 years. It seems an excess of caution in some critics to doubt the shepherd-kings of Manetho because not expressly mentioned by the Greek and Roman writers. See Sir John Stoddart, *Introduction*, p. 184; Quarterly Review, Apr. 1859, *Bunsen's Egypt.* In the account of Diodorus there is abundant room for such a race of kings. Why, else, should he speak of "*many* strangers being in Egypt *from all parts*, who used foreign rites in the sacred ministries and sacrifices?" And again, when he comes to the expulsion: "The men of other nations, therefore, were expelled; and of these the *noblest and bravest*, under the guidance of Danaus, Cadmus, and other *celebrated leaders*, came into Greece, and the parts adjacent," &c. &c. Niebuhr says: "The indescribable hatred of the Egyptians against the Hycsos is frequently manifested in the monuments. A red Egyptian has before him a yellow Asiatic in chains, and stamps upon him. We also find a quantity of painted papyrus sandals, in the interior of which a Hycsos is represented; so that the Egyptian, in putting his foot into the sandal, put it upon his enemy."—*Lectures*, vol. i. p. 43. A papyrus in the British Museum in which "a shepherd-king" is mentioned may be quoted as further evidence. The "celebrated leaders" of such a race would easily obtain the name and rank of "kings," and would, doubtless, in prosperous times, have dis-

CHAP. IV.

thirteen years after their final exclusion by Amosis; and that they were in power during Abraham's visit to that country. With Amosis and his successors, may be said to begin the true historical period of Egypt, though we are able to gather much from the monuments appertaining to earlier periods. The magnificent tombs and temples with which Egypt abounded, were covered with elaborate devices, serving the double purpose of ornamentation and historical record. Of the successors of Amosis[1], however, we have some exact notices in extant authors. And it is of some interest to know, that somewhere in this dynasty, or in the early part of the following, it is generally agreed to place the great event of the Exodus. Civilisation had now attained its highest point in Egypt, and her kings their utmost grandeur. Commerce had largely extended; and the recent introduction of the horse had added a new arm to their military strength. In arts they had been famous from the earliest period; and the monuments leave us no

played a proportionate royal state. Comp. last note, and see other general evidence of an Hycsos domination in the note appended to Chap. II.

[1] This name is indifferently written, Ames, Amosis, and Tethmosis. It should be observed, that the spelling of words seems to have been very irregular in the Egyptian demotic character, leading often, both on the monuments and in other records, to a great diversity of names for one and the same individual. Thotmes III., for example, "is remarkable," says Sir Gardner Wilkinson, "for the great variety in the mode of writing his name, of which I have more than thirty varieties!"—Rawlinson's *Herod.*, *Append.*, book ii. ch. viii. § 20.

room to doubt, that long before this time, they had in this respect attained a very high degree of excellence. This important discovery would lead to the conclusion that they must have originally imported the knowledge of arts and sciences from the original cradle of civilisation. It is not reasonable to think that all scientific knowledge perished in the flood. It was doubtless, handed down and perpetuated in the family of Noah,—and like the elements of religion itself, spread from the Asiatic centre to the different lands peopled and colonised by his sons and descendants. Among the rest, they seem to have brought letters, or alphabetical characters; and even that knowledge of the one Supreme God, and those notions of a future state, which seem never wholly to have died out, even under the degrading forms of superstition with which they were overlaid. Such is the conclusion of the most eminent writers, particularly as regards the early date of civilisation among this people, which, therefore, we may ascribe, not to their own unassisted genius, but to the advantages of birth and early tradition. We forbear to trace their history minutely onwards through subsequent periods: how they fell at length under Cambyses, and became tributary to Persia; soon after to Alexander; the reigns of the Ptolemies and their successors, and their wars with the kings of Syria; how they were forced to implore succours of the Romans, B.C. 203; how they became, under

CHAP. IV.

Cleopatra, a mere Roman province; afterwards the seat of a Christian Patriarchate; and how they were finally over-run and subdued by the Mahomedan armies under the Caliph Omar, A.D. 666.

There are other kingdoms which deserve to be classified, not only in point of antiquity, but as seemingly of kindred race and origin with this of Egypt. Thus Phœnicia had certainly its kingdom of Tyre; and a still more conspicuous offset in Carthage. But the great rival empire was clearly that of Assyria—not the later Chaldeo-Babylonian monarchy begun by Nabonassar, but that founded by Ninus at a much earlier period. Here, again, the monuments are our principal guide. And these, most assuredly, bespeak a similar character and antiquity with those of Egypt. They are marked, indeed, with that bold and massive exuberance which suited the youth of the world, and of which it may be said with equal truth as of the human stature in times before the flood[1], "There were giants in the earth in those days." The exact date of those wonderful structures, and of the early period of Babylon's greatness (for it was here that Ninus established his capital), can only now be matter of conjecture. Like the Egyptians, this people indulged in the wildest and most extravagant assertions on this head,—ascribing to themselves an antiquity agreed on all hands to be entirely fabulous, though they professed to derive

[1] Gen. vi. 4.

it from astronomical calculations. In the time of Alexander the Great, and upon the taking of Babylon by that king, a Grecian, Callisthenes, is said to have been employed by Aristotle, to ascertain by strict inquiries the true period to which those calculations reached back. He found it to be about 1,900 years; which would give us in round numbers, for the first foundation of the Assyrian Empire by Belus, the father of Ninus, B.C. 2,200. Taking now the Scripture account,—which gives us Nimrod for the founder, and places him in the second generation from Ham—we have only to take some fifty or sixty years from the usual date of the flood, and it ought to tally with this other computation; which it actually does, according to the Hebrew chronology, within a few years. The longer chronology of the LXX. and of Josephus, would not materially alter the case. Thus we have found a very tolerable approximation to a right date for the first beginnings of the Assyrian Empire; and have so far harmonised sacred with profane history. A various translation of the Hebrew (Gen. x. 11) introduces a slight confusion in this part of the narrative. "Out of that land went forth *Asshur*, and builded Nineveh." Now the *Asshur* of Scripture occurs elsewhere (Ch. x. 22) as a son of Shem. To the Semitic race, therefore, would seem to be ascribed in this verse, some share in the settlement of Assyria, or at least in the erection of a rival city at Nineveh.

CHAP. IV.

But another translation makes it, "From that land he," *i.e.* Nimrod, "went out *into Assyria*, and founded Nineveh:" which agrees better with the account in the text, and is the more approved rendering. There is at the same time, every reason to think, that, in the first beginnings of the Assyrian, as of the Egyptian Empire, the two races of Shem and Ham were very much mixed up. Such an intermixture could hardly be avoided, so near to the central and original seat of civilisation. And it accounts for the Assyrians at a later period appearing to understand the Jews' language, and the Jews the Assyrians'.[1]

But without pursuing the history further, we may now gather into one view the scattered notices in Genesis as regards this line of Ham, which, however brief, are sufficient to constitute that very surprising link which we are tracing between the written pages of Moses, and the existing facts of history. And we ask, as before, can any attentive and impartial reader fail to recognise in "Mizraim" (Gen. x. 6) the El-Misr[2], to this day the vernacular name of Egypt? in the Patriarch Ham, its still more ancient name Chemi?[3] in the "Caphtorim" (Gen. x. 14) the Copts?[4] in

[1] See 2 Kings, xviii. 26—28; Isa. xxxvi. 11—13.

[2] Τὴν Αἴγυπτον Μέσρην, καὶ Μεσραίους τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἅπαντες οἱ ταύτην οἰκοῦντες καλοῦμεν. —Joseph. *Antiq.* i. 6.

[3] See Rawlinson's *Herod.* ii. § 15.

[4] The root also of Αἰ-Γυπτ-ος. (Γυπτ = Copt.)

"Cush" (Gen. x. 6) Cuzestan? in "Nimrod" (Gen. x. 8, 9) Ninias and Nineveh? in "Babel" (Gen. x. 10) Babylon? in "Calah" and "Calneh" (Gen. x. 10, 11) Chaldæa? The matter is really as plain and plainer than half the things we are in the habit of admitting on far less evidence every day; as that "shire," "share," "sheer," "shore," "sheriff," indicate some common root signifying to "divide:" — that "journal" and "diurnal," meet in their original "dies;" and that "stock" in all its various senses may be traced to an ancient participle of the verb to "stick!" Add, that in the Scripture "*Noph*" (not however a Genesis word) all are agreed to recognise the root of the Egyptian Memphis, originally written (and still found so on the monuments)[1] M'-Nuph-i; and Osburn suspects the Scripture "Noah" in the Egyptian God Nu or Nub, for "the great abyss."[2] Not that mere verbal correspondence is all we have to allege; we have shown that facts agree as well as names; the earlier intimations of Moses tally with the later researches of history and science.

Before we pass on to the third of the principal races concerned in the dispersion, we will stop to notice a few particulars, as to the variety of languages which formed so strong a distinguishing feature between them all. Owing to the necessary mixture of races, of which we have lately taken

[1] Osburn, *Monumental History of Egypt*, vol. ii. pp. 261, 506.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i. pp. 239, 240.

CHAP. IV.

notice in the line of Ham, as inseparable from the geographical proximity of their earliest settlements, and also, doubtless, from commercial relations afterwards, it cannot be expected that the line of demarcation should always be strictly kept, or even distinctly perceptible. But with all this partial confusion, and under all the varieties of classification that occur among philologists, there is still a remarkable analogy between the races and the tongues, which we proceed to state under their several heads.

(*a.*) We have a distinct language for the line of *Shem.* It was, indeed, long suspected that the Semitic language would prove the one mother tongue of all. This idea, though now very generally abandoned, serves at any rate to show the wide-spread use and influence, as well as the distinctive character of that very ancient language — the staple of the Arabic, the Hebrew, the Chaldee, and the Syriac, and which is called the *Semitic* or Aramæan. It was spoken in these various dialects and others in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Arabia, and was the general and stationary language of all those parts. Its characteristic according to *Bopp*, consisted in its having three consonants for the root, and dissyllabic verbs. Through its use in Arabic literature, and also from its being made the medium of Divine revelation, this is undoubtedly the most venerable, if not exactly the most ancient of all the tongues we are acquainted with. (*b.*) Coming next to the line of Ham, we

meet with the difficulty before alluded to, arising from the frequent early intercommunion and admixture of this race with the line of Shem. It is to this, perhaps, that we must ascribe whatever of similarity there subsists between the Syriac and the Coptic. The most distinguishing mark, perhaps, of the sons of Ham, is their addiction generally to the hieroglyphic character. Beyond this it may be difficult to assign any exact language to the descendants of Ham, unless we take the third in the threefold division of Sir William Jones, viz. the *Sclavonic*[1], and suppose that as they spread

[1] It is not pretended that an exact agreement can be found between the number of the languages and that of the races mentioned in the text, or that no other considerable varieties are to be found. The extreme variety of the dialects, and the great difficulty of sorting them under proper heads, would make any such assumption in the highest degree absurd. Thus, in Caucasia alone, we are assured that among tribes numbering not more than 500,000 people, there are found some 36 different dialects. See Haxthausen's *Tribes of the Caucasus*, pp. 16, 21. In the South Sea islands the Bishop of New Zealand has found as many different tongues as there are islands. In India and in Africa, the diversity seems not much less in the different tribes. What is asserted in the text, is simply this:—That for the sons of Shem and of Japheth, at least, there are found two great mother-tongues, the use of which, from the necessary admixture of peoples, more or less spread to the settlements of Ham. In all their known settlements we find that wherever they went, those particular tongues went with them, and the traces of one invariably assist us in finding the place of the other; and the last assertion is, that, with their places thus discovered or confirmed, the accounts in Genesis will be found most remarkably to fit in and correspond. That there were other tongues besides, we do not question; but as none can show that they were of the same antiquity with those that have been ascribed to the Semitic and Japhetian races, so no one disputes that, in the progress of the dispersion, such new languages were likely enough to spring up and be disseminated in the parts more recently brought into occupation. It is, however, remarkable that the classification

CHAP. IV.

northward, and gradually formed into a perfectly distinct community from the Semitic branch, this Sclavonic language rose up among them, and became distinctive of the nations with whom they amalgamated, and of whom indeed they might have been the original root. Along with the above, though we have not yet followed the history of this line, we will mention, (*c.*) That most remarkable language of all, — the root of the Indo-European tongues, — the great trunk language, as it were, of all the civilised world: that which, in Bopp's division, consists of monosyllabic roots, susceptible of composition. The Sanscrit is considered the mother-tongue in this division. And from it we find diverging, on the one hand the Teutonic and the Celtic, and on the other the classic tongues of Greece and Rome. And thus it has been the vehicle of all the commerce and civilisation of the West: fitly, therefore,

of that great oriental scholar, *Sir William Jones,* corresponds very nearly with our three races, viz. (1.) the *Arabic,* (2.) the *Sanscrit,* (3.) the *Sclavonic.* This latter might belong to the north-eastern settlements of the sons of Ham, to whom, in a former note we have ascribed the characters of the great Mongolian race which peopled those parts. We have, however, no disposition to deny what other philologists have since asserted,— that there are minor peculiarities, as in the Chinese or monosyllabic character; others among the Polynesian tribes; others, again, in the American, and so on,— which cannot well be reduced to those *principal* languages of the civilised world on which we have here enlarged. Bopp, in like manner, attempted a threefold division; the third of which admits a similar distinct class of languages for the N. and NE. tribes, which has been since called the *Turanian.* See Max Müller on the *Non-Iranian and Non-Semitic Languages.*

belonging to a race whose frequent migrations and commercial activity have enabled them to carry both their language and their arts to all corners of the world.

3. And now, in accordance with this last observation, we have only to notice, in the third great division of our subject, the history of that line of Japhet, which we thus connect with the most widespread and polished of all known languages, and to see how wonderfully its history corresponds. From the time that Cadmus brought letters to Greece, and Greece passed them over to Italy, what interchange of arts, what rivalry of progress, what commercial activity and enterprise may we not trace in the monuments of those countries, and by the testimony of accredited authors! The first colonies of Greece came from Egypt; but, Cadmus sailing directly from Phœnicia, the letters he brought with him are, perhaps, to be considered of Phœnician rather than Egyptian origin. The Argonautic expedition, the Theban war, the siege of Troy, attest the early spirit of enterprise which distinguished this people. Greece began soon to push forward to Italy. But it seems she found herself preceded there by earlier settlements, particularly the Etruscan, Umbrian, and earlier Latin races. The Siculi were also spread along the whole north-eastern coast. Phœnician ships had probably brought new settlers, wherever they landed — settlers more or less of the same race,

CHAP. IV.

but ready to receive from Greece whatever she might bring of her own religion and arts. It is remarkable that, while the whole people of Greece was called by the Latins Pelasgi, Pelasgus is said to have visited Italy not many years after Cadmus arrived in Thebes. From which it is evident that Pelasgus was some generic name for a sea-faring and scattered people — a name which passed from a leader, probably, to a tribe, from a tribe to a nation, and from the nation to the individual members. Later still, in Italy, a community of freebooters, throwing their protection over all who resorted to their infant city, founded Rome. Through the line of her kings, consuls, dictators, emperors, Rome became gradually the mistress of the world. In the east and the south she crushed, or undermined, the ancient kingdoms of Parthia, Syria, and Egypt : while Greece, Gaul, Britain, and many people of the north and west of Germany, yielded to her sway. If after this she outgrew her own strength, and broke up the magnificent empire she had acquired, it was rather to mix with surrounding nations than to be subdued by them. And, in mixing, she leavened them with the remains of her ancient civilisation and laws. The Teutonic and Gothic hordes, which had poured down upon her, and had seized the more fruitful plains of the south, infused a fresh spirit of liberty into the mixed forms of polity which now arose, and upon which were founded

those numerous kingdoms, which have since constituted the platform of modern and Christian Europe. Such being the stirring character of the third, or Japhetian, branch, what a foreshadowing of it may we not see in the very names set down by Moses in that part of his genealogy! More still, in his express assertion (Genesis x. 5), "By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided:" an assertion repeated and generalised (ver. 32), "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and by these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood." The very name of Japhet is preserved in the annals of the poet:

> . . . ἑὺς παῖς Ἰαπέτοιο
>
> Hes. Ἔργ. καὶ Ἡμέρ. ι.

Javan, his son, is equally perpetuated in the Ἰάονες of Homer:

> Ἐνθὰ δὲ Βοιῶτοι καὶ Ἰάονες,

the Mare *Ionium*, and, generally, in the *Ionic* tribes of Greece. "The King of Grecia" (Dan. viii. 21) is, in the Hebrew, "King of *Javan*." (יָוָן) The same occurs for the isles of Greece, Is. lxvi. 19, Ezek. xxvii. 13; Æsch., *Pers.*, 182, 569, 1009; Aristoph. *Acharn.*, 104.[1] So with the other sons of Japhet:—in "Tiras" (Gen. x. 2), we have "Thrace; in "Gomer (Gen. x. 2, 3), the Cimmerii,

[1] Where the Scholiast has—πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας Ἰάονας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν.

CHAP. IV.

Cymri, Gemri, Germans; in "Riphath" (Gen. x. 3), the Riphæi; in Kittim (Gen. x. 4), Citium, a trading port of Cyprus, and hence the isles beyond, (transferred to the Greeks generally, see 1 Macc. i. 1); in "Elishah" (Gen. x. 4), Elis, or Hellas; in "Magog" and "Meshech," the great Scythian, Tartar, and Muscovite tribes.

These analogies though apparently founded on the bare names of a few more eminent persons, are certainly remarkable. But the analogy, as was before observed, is more than in name. In physiognomy, language, habits, indications are found of a stream of enterprise continually flowing westward from an Asiatic centre, the people bringing letters and the seeds of a superior civilisation and knowledge in arts and sciences along with them. The Mosaic account, so far from contradicting this idea, remarkably confirms it. Other indications merely lead us to *suspect* an original connection between the people thus reaching and visiting the different shores, as the only hypothesis to solve the existing phenomena. *Moses enables us actually to trace this connection.* In two passages he marks out with a few strokes of his pen that very tendency which has characterised the several branches of this race, and which has been the secret of their spreading so far, and having such influence upon the civilisation and progress of the world: "God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem" (Gen. ix. 27); and, "By these" (the

sons of Japhet) "were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands." This people seem evidently gifted from the first with that spirit of industry and love of enterprise, which has made them the great colonisers of Europe and the West, and which has eventuated in the strong stirring spirit, the busy inventive genius of the Anglo-Saxon, and the lively, social, and civilising temper of the Celt, and which finally, engrafted upon the faith of Christ, has been the great instrument of dispelling the darkness of heathenism, and diffusing the Gospel light.

By the help of a little imagination, but not more than is accorded to the genius of modern criticism when it seeks to create for us, out of scraps of ancient legends and mythic tales, a kind of *Textus receptus* of early history, we might easily go further, and expand the brief hints in Genesis into a tolerably complete sketch of ancient Europe. We have only to fill up the outline given us, as to the several directions taken by the three sons of Japhet and their descendants, and imagine to ourselves the several advantages of soil and climate, which each would find awaiting him on taking the directions which they did. Those who entered Greece, for instance, we can well conceive to have settled down contentedly at once, while the more northern settlers, led at first by the same irresistible impulse to wander in quest of habitations, yet not meeting with the same attractions, would feel themselves

CHAP. IV.

less permanently tied to their new settlements. And we might expect to hear, as indeed we do, of their afterwards repairing elsewhere in search of improvement; thereby accounting for all those frequent incursions of Gothic hordes, which occupy so large a place in the real history of subsequent times. We only mention this to show that in designating a certain migratory disposition as the peculiar characteristic of the Japhetian family, Moses strikes the very key-note of their history. And as nothing could harmonise better with actual facts, though it could only have been known to him by Divine illumination, so nothing could more clearly show that he possessed that gift of illumination, and was raised up for his office by the special providence of God. There are two names which occur in the Mosaic record, and whose remarkable application we have not yet noticed, but have reserved them for particular mention here, where we think they may serve more strikingly to corroborate our argument. In the outline we before gave of the Grecian colonies, it appeared that a people called Pelasgi made a prominent figure in the early history of Greece, indeed, that the Latins frequently denominated the whole people by that generic name. The Tusci or Etruscans were not less famous in their way. The Pelasgi, however, bearing the character of a peaceful and quiet people — people of passage from place to place, and carrying, doubtless, the seeds of an early civilisation, and the elements of

an oriental tongue; the Tusci, a seafaring people also, but of more commanding genius, probably shipbuilders and merchant carriers to the other, being themselves of a sterner and more martial spirit. What is the probable origin of each? We find the latter indifferently written Tusci, Tuschi, and Turschi, and we submit that they may have had some connection with the Scripture "Tarshish." We also subscribe to the opinion of Bochart, Stillingfleet [1], &c., that the Pelasgi came from "Peleg."

[1] See several reasons for this derivation of the Pelasgi, in Stillingfleet. He quotes this description of them from Strabo:—Πολλαχοῦ τῆς Εὐρώπης τὸ παλαῖον πλανώμενοι· and again, πολύπλανον καὶ ταχὺ τὸ ἔθνος πρὸς ἐπαναστάσεις· and he adds: "These Pelasgi confined not themselves to Greece, but were dispersed into the neighbour islands, as Chios, Crete, Lesbos, Lemnos, Imbro, Samos, as will appear afterwards; and at last came into Italy, as is well known, and are thought to be the same with the Tyrrhenians, and by some conceived to be the first founders of Rome. After the Hellenes began to appear, Greece was divided into τὸ Πελασγικὸν and τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν, as Herodotus witnesseth, and so these two appear to be a very different people from one another, and not the same under different names, as is commonly thought. This sufficiently appears from their language, wherein they differed quite from one another. So Herodotus: Ἦσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ βάρβαρον γλῶσσαν ἱέντες, *they used a barbarous language.* That the Pelasgi may with great probability be derived from פלג, *Phaleg*, we have the concurrent testimony of two learned persons, Grotius and Salmasius, who are contented to mention it without bringing much evidence of reason for it. Epiphanius de Scythis (1 *Ep. ad Acu.* § 2) brings them from Scythia. And that some of Shem's posterity settled in those parts it is elsewhere manifest. Coming down first into Thessalia, they seem to have fixed themselves chiefly in Arcadia (Πελασγοὶ οἱ Θεσσαλοὶ γένος ἀπὸ Πελασγοῦ τοῦ Ἀρκάδος γενόμενον πολυπλάνητον· Hesychius), and thence spread up and down by degrees towards the seaside. And hence the agreement of the ancient Greek language with the Hebrew in many of its primitive words; as also the remainders of the Eastern tongues,

CHAP. IV.

These are not accidental nor unimportant coincidences. No one, we think, can have followed the thread of our argument — can have compared the suggestive hints of Genesis with accomplished facts of history, descriptions in embryo with answering events long after developed and matured — without being disposed to ascribe to the books containing such hints a character distinct from any mere uninspired document. Say that the author, owing to the circumstances of the times, had peculiar facilities of information handed down by tradition: what should have led him, out of the mass of facts thus made known to him, to make such a remarkable selection? How should he have hit upon just the very names and persons which have proved, in the result, to tell most exactly upon the history of all future times — names which fill up an hiatus in our knowledge of the past, and to which no other known records have given us access? Such antiquarian lore would have been remarkable in an author whose professed object it was to search into the history of nations. But Moses had no such direct object. The genealogies recorded by him were chiefly with a view to the future bearing of countries or kingdoms, whose beginnings are there intimated, on the

in those places, such as Crete, Hetruria, &c., where the Pelasgi had been.

Ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἐν δὲ ..... δῖοί τε Πελασγοί.
Hom. *Od.* T. 175."

— Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sacræ*, b. iii. ch. iv.

history of the Jewish people[1], and thereby on the history of the whole Christian Church. The information, therefore, which we obtain, falls from him, as it were, incidentally, and certainly with no design to show off superior learning; and yet it may be safely pronounced that it supplies a link in our knowledge of the past which may at once be relied upon as genuine, and has not been supplied from any other quarter. There may, here and there, be room for some difference of construction; there may, perhaps, be a temptation to a little fancy in the application of a name; but the general argument rests on far more than a mere disquisition on words. We have before us, underlying the brief outline in Genesis, a real relation, striking deep into actual history, and capable of being verified by it; we have something to guide us through periods not easily explored by other lights, yet well according and harmonising with all that is really known of succeeding times. Such knowledge belongs to a higher order of intelli-

[1] While on this subject of the particular scope of these genealogies of Moses, we may add the following additional argument for the veracity of the whole account: "The coherence and synchronism of all the parts of the Mosaical chronology, especially after the Flood, bears a most singular testimony to the truth of his history and computation; for although he draws not the lineal descendants of Ham and Japhet down to his own time, but only mentions their children and grandchildren, for two or three generations at most, yet he draws down the lineal pedigree from Shem in the sacred line down to his very age, together with their births and ages; which are a great evidence of the probability of the rest of his account." — *Origination of Mankind*, § 2. c. 3.

gence than ordinarily falls to the lot of man. Even if the names in the tenth chapter, taken by themselves, proved nothing to the purpose; if they were too slender a foundation to build anything upon, beyond the mere deductions of a fanciful etymology; yet, when we find other passages, the production of the same pen, serving to unfold the allusions contained in that chapter, and, under the form of direct prophecies, carrying on the thread of those allusions: when further we have the means of testing them by the actual and still growing fulfilment of these prophecies, there is, in all this, evidence that cannot be resisted, of a more than natural ability in the person of the narrator, — of something which challenges our peculiar attention and respect.

On one of these passages (Gen. ix. 27), the learned Mede makes the following remark: "Consider the blessing of Japhet, That *God would enlarge him into the tents of Shem, and that Cham should be his servant.* There hath never yet been a son of Cham that hath shaken a sceptre over the head of Japhet. Shem hath subdued Japhet, and Japhet subdued Shem; but Cham never subdued either. And this fate was it that made Hannibal, a child of Canaan, cry out with the amazement of his soul, *Agnosco fatum Carthaginis!* The Saracens, indeed, once spoiled us; but they were no Chamites, but Arabians of the seed of Ishmael; and yet because a great number of their kind were afterwards of the

Moors and Chamish Arabians, we see they were in a moment shaken off by Japhet, and made to keep themselves within their African limits." He to whom it was given thus to predict the future was, assuredly, no common man. To have called the persons by name, from whom afterwards the most famous places and nations were called, was itself no ordinary talent; but to predict the very fortunes of their families and remotest descendants, this was a thing only to be done and accounted for by the hypothesis for which we have contended, viz. that of a supernatural illumination marking out the author as a special organ in the hands of Providence for conveying to mankind revelations designed for the instruction and benefit of all succeeding ages.

Origin of Language.—"We may explain many of the differences and changes in languages, which we become acquainted with, by referring to the action of causes of change which still operate. But what glossologist will venture to declare that the efficacy of such causes has been uniform; that the influences which mould a language, operated formerly with no more efficacy than they exercise now? In the earliest stages of man's career, the revolutions of language must have been, even by the evidence of the theoretical history of language itself, of an order altogether different from any which have take place within the recent history of man. And we may add, that as the early stages of the progress of language must have been widely different from those later ones of which we can in some measure trace the natural causes, we cannot place the origin of language in any point of view in which it comes under the jurisdiction of natural causation at all."—Whewell, *Indications of the Creator*, pp. 164, 165.

CHAP. V.

Relation of Geology to the Scripture Narrative.

"Præclare Aristoteles: Si essent, inquit, qui repente terram et maria cœlumque vidissent: nubium magnitudinem, ventorumque vim cognovissent, adspexissentque solem, ejusque tum magnitudinem pulchritudinemque, tum etiam efficientiam cognovissent, quod is diem efficeret toto cœlo luce diffusâ; cum autem terras nox opacâsset, tum cœlum totum cernerent astris distinctum et ornatum, lunæque luminum tum crescentis tum senescentis, eorumque omnium ortus et occasus, atque in omni æternitate ratos immutabilesque cursus; hæc cùm viderent, profecto et esse Deos et hæc tanta opera Deorum esse arbitrarentur."

Cic. *De Nat. D.* lib. ii. c. 37.

"Every house is builded by some man: but he that built all things is God."

Heb. iii. 4.

CHAP. V.

It is no disparagement of geology to speak of it as a science yet in its infancy, and which has not attained the same fixity and stability with the older sciences. Considering, indeed, the difficulties through which it has struggled, the lateness of the discoveries on which it is founded, and the extensive areas of observation necessary to a due generalisation of its laws, it is only surprising that it should have made so great a progress, and that so much of agreement as to general principles should already subsist among the various schools of its professors. Yet, as every day brings fresh dis-

coveries, the conclusions of yesterday are continually shifting, or at least are subject to considerable modification; and we find ourselves dealing with principles which cannot yet offer any certain resting-place to the mind of the inquirer.[1] It is the more necessary that we should seek to avoid any false light from supposed scriptural allusions, which may only tend in the minds of some to involve this science in still greater obscurity; while with others it may have the still more mischievous effect of bringing the Scripture itself into disrepute, by making it answer for our own arbitrary and perhaps ill-grounded suppositions. Now it may well be doubted whether Scripture was intended to teach geology at all.[2] At least we may be sure that, whatever light it may indirectly throw on this or any other secular science,

[1] Dr. Kalisch, in a recent learned Commentary on Genesis, taking an opposite point of departure,—assuming, that is to say, the perfection of geology and the imperfection of the Mosaic cosmogony,—naturally finds contradictions where there are none, and seems quite unnecessarily afraid of any attempt, however countenanced by men as learned as himself, to reconcile the two. See Kalisch's *Commentary, Gen. Introd.* pp. 1, 2, 43—52.

[2] "The disappointment of those who look for a detailed account of geological phenomena in the Bible, rests on a gratuitous expectation of finding therein historical information respecting all the operations of the Creator in times and places with which the human race has no concern. As reasonably might we object that the Mosaic history is imperfect because it makes no specific mention of the satellites of Jupiter or the rings of Saturn, as feel disappointment at not finding in it details of geology, which may be fit matter for an encyclopædia of science, but are foreign to the objects of a volume intended only to be a guide of religious belief and moral conduct."—Buckland, *Bridgewater Treatise,* vol. i. p. 14.

CHAP. V.

it can only be incidental and subordinate to its main object, which is clearly of another and a higher kind. The question is an open one, how far it should be required, in a book professing to contain a Divine revelation, that where it diverges into physical details those details should be in perfect accordance with other known truth; or, how far it might be expedient to adopt a mere popular phraseology on these particular points. Thus: where, in the first chapter of Genesis, mention is made of "the stars," and among them of "two great lights," and "of a greater and a lesser light," it is but too obvious to see that the phrase is accommodated to the natural impressions of the spectator; and the question immediately arises as to this mode of speaking being the exception or the rule. Be this decided as it may, the main point assuredly is, that, however it may have been necessary to reduce ideas to the level of ordinary apprehension by clothing them in popular language, it is our first business to seize the great ruling thoughts, and to gather the lessons which are principally intended to be conveyed, even as we would separate the precious kernel from the husk. Providing for this, we should be extremely cautious how we strain the sacred text, and make it answer for any crude conceptions, any hasty conclusions of our own. A right and reverent appreciation of its main object is the proper safeguard against any such error. It is the first thing re-

quired for obtaining the true point of view from which to contemplate the geological bearings of the narrative in Genesis.

The ascription, then, of all created matter, and of all the forms of it, to the one true God, was clearly the main object of the writer. Contrasted and confronted with this great idea we must place before our minds the prevailing errors which were abroad, and with which Moses had to contend. We must remember how divinity had begun to be ascribed to the various forms of nature, to the "greater lights" of the sun and moon, and to all the beauteous constellations which sparkle in the heavens, and appear like presiding spirits to the earth; —how the worship of universal nature had spread everywhere;—how kings and heroes had been deified, and men paid divine honours to their fellow-men. It was the work of Moses to demolish this material Pantheon, and to build upon its ruins the foundation of a purer worship, the acknowledgment of the one supreme Creator. The whole world was to be exhibited as His temple, made for His express service, and peopled by various gradations of creatures, each in his capacity fitted to show forth His praise. Man, especially, was Nature's high priest, alone among the creatures capable of giving distinct and intelligent utterance to the praises of the Omnipotent. That all this was to be expressed in language wholly remote from the conceptions of the age, and adapted rather to the precision and

CHAP. V.

refinement of modern science, is so irrational a requirement, that it could only, one would think, be resorted to as the last refuge of some preconceived but weak and untenable theory. The very difficulty of finding appropriate terms might, indeed, have been the reason why the account is so brief and restricted as it is. It would certainly have been interesting to know more; to have had more revealed to us, specially, about other intelligences in the universe, of whose creation we have here absolutely nothing related. It might have seemed neither undesirable nor unprofitable to man to have learnt something of other orders in creation, more nearly resembling himself; and whether there be any and what superior beings to him, or how far he was destined to grow into a likeness and equality with the highest. As it is, these points are left an utter blank in the record; and all we can do is to form conjectures upon them, borrowed from the best lights we have. Looking only at Genesis, and measuring man by the sphere which he occupies, to some it has appeared that as the earth, his habitation, is a mere speck in infinite space, the position of man, its chief inhabitant, cannot be far removed above that of the caterpillar which crawls on its surface. Melancholy, but happily narrow and one-sided, view of the question! A wider and deeper consideration might lead us to reflect by what rare and extraordinary gifts and capacities man is dis-

tinguished from all the inferior creatures; how he was made in the image and reflexion of his Maker; how he may hold converse with angels, and is fitted to rise ultimately, if he have never yet reached, to an equality with them[1]; how, in his very outward position (as it seems, at least, to the eye of the observer) there is something corresponding to this innate and intrinsic superiority. For, look at the centrality, so to speak, of the earth among the surrounding planets: the subordination, not only of earthly things, but, in a measure, of the very heavenly bodies themselves to the use and convenience of earth's noblest inhabitant and lord. From these and such like considerations we should surely rise to far higher and nobler conceptions of the original and ultimate destination of the human family. Man's foundation may be in the dust, and his days as it were a span long; but look at the almost endless capacity of improvement, "the thoughts which" even now "wander through eternity," the upward look, the still more upward spirit, the far-seeing stretch of mind, the boundless range of imagination, the aspirations of the heart to a Supreme Good, unsatisfied by anything here below! These may not be the thoughts that are uppermost in the minds of most men, who turn to Genesis for a solution of great physical phenomena; but we believe them to have been in

[1] See the expression in St. Luke, xx. 36: *ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσι, καὶ υἱοί εἰσι τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

CHAP. V.

the breast of Moses when he indited that book. We believe them to have been the great puzzle with all the sages and wiser men of that day. But on the sacred penman himself we doubt not they were prominently and deeply impressed. They struggled within him for a solution more complete than it was permitted even to him to attain. Compared with this he cared but little for the curiosities of the outer world: it was not, indeed, the age when philosophy was yet taking the turn of a nice physical investigation. The want of this, which is so much the pride and delight of the present day, was, perhaps, then in a measure compensated for, by a more intense admiration of Nature as she appeared in her outward garb. If there was less acquaintance with the secret powers of Nature, if the reason was less exercised upon her laws, if less of that refined pleasure was experienced which now springs from the study of those laws and the curious discoveries of natural science;—there was that other pleasure, peculiar to the youth-time of the earth's present economy, of a more vivid impression on the senses continually kept up by the steadier and more congenial glow of the climate, the greater clearness of the air, and the fresher beauty of the landscape. Pearls and jewels, so much more abundant in the East, would have feasted the eyes of that generation, and created as much pleasure in the possession and admiration of them, as the philosopher finds at the present time

in his collection of rare specimens of stones and pebbles. If there is more satisfaction and pride from the labour of collecting, this was balanced then by the greater profusion and greater brilliancy to the eye of the beholder.

Let us figure, then, to our minds this first thought of Moses, to vindicate the worship and authority of the one true God, and to represent man as foremost among the creatures who were made by His hand. Add to this the no less pressing want and desire of his soul, to search yet deeper into the mind of the Spirit, and to know by what means it was destined hereafter to accomplish man's promised restoration after the Fall, by the chosen seed of the woman, how the great purposes of his being were yet to be realised, and the capacities for good to take effect. We are not about to deny that there was an intention, besides this, to dwell somewhat on the physical; but in proportion as we endeavour to realise the spiritual, we doubt not our estimate of the other will be more correct and true. Taking our own stand on the same height with Moses, we shall the more easily follow him along the sacred perspective. Rapt, as we may imagine him, in heavenly contemplation, he is in the attitude best adapted for receiving the Divine communications. And now a great vision [1] appears to have been given

[1] It scarcely seems necessary to justify the use of the term *vision*, in describing the revelation given to Moses at the time here spoken of, to enable him to record the acts of Creation. Unless we adopt

CHAP. V.

him. Lines of sight, as it were, stretching in illimitable length from eternity, and running parallel towards him from the mystic beginning of all things, as they at length converge to his eye in their first measurable dimensions, convey the image of an earth preparing for the use and reception of man. It was an earth, be it specially observed, not necessarily at that time first created, but just then in a state of preparation for a new inhabitant,—an

the extreme opinion of supposing a literal and verbal inspiration, how else than by *vision* can he have been made to conceive of things buried in so remote a past? It seems but the natural language, in contemplating such a revelation, to say with Coleridge: "Let us carry us back in spirit to the mysterious week,—the teeming work-days of the Creation,—as they rose in *vision* before the eyes of the inspired historian."—*Aids to Reflection.* Indeed, the best writers on Inspiration will tell us that oftentimes in no other way could the human faculties have been employed to communicate Divine revelations at all, except by "visions" and imaginative pictures presented to the mind; unless we are to suppose those faculties altogether superseded and suspended, and no use of them made, in receiving or imparting the supernatural information conveyed. Thus the "seer" was the very title of the prophet (1 Sam. ix. 9; 1 Chron. xxix. 29). St. Paul says, "I will come to *visions* and revelations;" and St. John is bid "to write what he had *seen:*" "he bare record of the word of God .... and of all things that he *saw.*" (2 Cor. xii. 1; Rev. i. 2, 19.) The following is the remark of a judicious writer:—"When the ideas to be conveyed related to things which surpass the bounds of human experience, it is plain that ordinary language must fail to convey to others what was thus revealed. It was necessary, therefore, that such symbols or visible representations should be moulded, as it were, for the occasion, which would best conform to those ideas. .... And in the case of such visions, as in cases of natural poetic effusions, the imaginative faculty of the prophets naturally comes into play,—the Divine Spirit guiding the imagination, while clothing the ideas with appropriate symbols."—From Lee's *Inspiration of Holy Scripture* (Dublin, 1854), Lect. iv. We may refer the reader to a well-reasoned chapter on the same subject in Hugh Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks,* ch. iv.

inhabitant of whose existence, prior to the time spoken of, neither the pages of inspiration, nor the records of nature appear to give any intimation. Following at present the inspired record only, we should say that everything is made to point forward and bear directly upon man, as (next to the Omnipotent) the real hero of the scene. It is with a view to man's uses, that each day's work, as we pass along in the narrative, introduces to us successively the flower and fruit of the field, the cattle and creeping thing, the fowl of the air and the fish of the sea; and further, it was to disabuse man of any false notions of creature-worship, that every creature is made to fall into his place as part of the mere furniture of the dwelling thus made for man. This, we believe, is the only clue to the right conception of these opening scenes of sacred writ. It is not to exclude or to deny other stages of creation than that which accompanied and ushered in the first appearance of man upon the earth. It is not that the glorious light had never before dawned on other orders of created beings, till on the "first day God said, Let there be light, and there was light." God, we are expressly told, had from the beginning "clothed Himself with light as with a garment." He ever "dwelleth in the light unapproachable" to mortal eye, "whom no man hath seen or can see." Nor, again, have we a right to bring all the stars, much less the angels also, according to a favourite tradition of some, into the

CHAP. V.

work of the fourth day. What we do see is, that by a fresh creative, or, it may be, fresh moulding and formative act, the face of Nature is garnished anew, and its wide domain fresh furnished for a new inhabitant. The fairest and brightest forms are but a portion of that furniture. "Thou madest us, and not we ourselves," might each exclaim. They have a work to perform, a place assigned them, for the service and convenience of man;—but all in obedience to the laws of the CREATOR. The skill of Deity is impressed upon them; but they have no divinity in themselves. Birds, fishes, beasts, sun, moon, and stars,—these all might, in an after-day of decline, be invested with imaginary Divine honours, and figure among the false divinities of a degenerate age, but they are here presented to us in their only true view and position, as the creatures of God's hand and the dumb unconscious ministers of His will. We propose to enter more fully in a following chapter into the several particulars of the interesting account in Genesis. And among them will be embraced what concerns the higher and more spiritual, and not the mere material view of the creation of man. But, taking for our guide the sacred narrative itself, we hope to give at least a due proportion to the more material part, and to follow out whatever of interest to the scientific, and specially to the geological reader, may occur. But before we do so, it may conduce to the clearness of the argument,

if we begin by enunciating some principal conclusions to which, on this branch of the subject, we shall be led, and which may serve afterwards as a kind of general principles to guide us in any future inquiries. It should be borne in mind that errors on the side of exaggerating any literal intimations (or supposed intimations) of the inspired text may be as serious, and may lead in the end to as false conclusions, as the opposite error of ignoring or contradicting such intimations altogether. It requires no little care and discretion to avoid encumbering the statements of Scripture with false glosses of our own, and so charging upon them the responsibility of the crude and imperfect, or, it may be, the erroneous conceptions, to which our own imaginations may have led us. The following, then, are the chief points which will occupy our attention, and which appear to offer the best solution to the well-known difficulties that belong to this portion of Holy Writ.

1. To say something, first, of the whole title of the chapter (Gen. i.), as it stands in our English version, viz. THE CREATION. A distinction seems allowed by most Hebrew scholars between the words for "creating" and "making." The latter word may sometimes be used indifferently for the former; but the former has the stronger and more emphatic sense, and implies a *first production* of a something not existing before. Accordingly it is the word eminently employed in the first verse

CHAP. V.

of Genesis, and standing at the head of all that account which is vulgarly called the Creation. Nor does it seem without design that the same word is not again repeated, till verses 21 and 27, evidently marking out the creatures there named for special notice; while in chapter ii. verse 3, the distinction is expressly recognised and confirmed in the phrase "all His work which God *created* and *made*." From other Scriptures it would appear—what, indeed, seems naturally associated with our idea of an Almighty Creator — that the first matter was "created" out of nothing.[1] Not so everything that was "made."[2] From the change of terms, as well as from the reason of the thing, it would seem that the subsequent works were of the nature of some new forms and combinations of elements previously existing, rather than absolutely fresh creations. It is not, however, our intention, in what follows, to press this distinction beyond due bounds.[3] God might in an instant of time have

[1] See 2 Pet. iii. 5; Heb. xi. 3.

[2] "'Creavit,' scil. die primo *ex nihilo*, ut 'faceret' ex eo opera sequentium dierum.—Vetus auctor, Neheman., *apud Fagium, ad Gen.* ii. 3. David Kimchi, *ad Is.* xliii. 7: "Creavi eum, formavi eum, atque feci eum." Kimchi sic explicat: "'creavi *eum,' i.e. produxi eum de nihilo ad esse. Dein* 'formavi *eum,' eo quod feci eum existere dispositione formæ. Postremo* 'feci *eum,' hoc est, disposui seu ordinavi eum.*" Vid. plura *apud* Leigh, *Critic. Sacra* ad voc. בָּרָא.

[3] Compare the statement of the learned Regius Professor of Hebrew in Oxford: "After having continually re-read and studied this account, I can come to no other result than that the words 'created' and 'made' are synonymous (although the former is to us the stronger of the two), and that, because they are so constantly interchanged; as, Gen. i. 21, 'God *created* great whales;' ver. 25, 'God *made* the beast of the earth;' ver. 26, 'Let us *make* man;' ver. 27, 'So God *created* man.' At the

called into being the first elements of matter;—and from these might have been wrought all subsequent forms and creations in nature. But on these matters we have no clear revelation to guide us; nor can we without irreverence prescribe the manner or the limits of the Divine agency. For aught we know, there may be yet new elements produced; and there is certainly every appearance in nature, that creation after creation has been going on down to the present epoch, which brought man upon the stage. It will be well if

same time it is very probable that בָּרָא ('created'), as being the stronger word, was selected to describe the first production of the heaven and the earth. The point, however, upon which the interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis appears to me *really* to turn, is, whether the two first verses are merely a summary statement of what is related in detail in the rest of the chapter, and a sort of introduction to it; or whether they contain an account of an act of creation. . . . . Many of the Fathers supposed the two first verses of Genesis to contain an account of a distinct and prior act of creation: some, as Augustine, Theodoret, and others, that of the creation of matter; others, that of the elements; others, again (and they the most numerous), imagine that not these visible heavens, but what they think to be called elsewhere the 'highest heavens,' the 'heaven of heavens,' are here spoken of,—our visible heavens being related to have been created on the second day. Petavius regards the light as the only act of creation of the first day; considering the two first verses as a summary of the account of creation which was about to follow, and a general declaration that all things were made by God. Episcopius, again, and others, thought that the creation and fall of the bad angels took place in the interval here spoken of: and misplaced as such speculations are, still they seem to show that it is natural to suppose that a considerable interval may have taken place between the creation related in the first verse of Genesis and that of which an account is given in the third and following verses."—From note by Dr. Pusey to Buckland's *Bridgewater Treatise*, vol. i. pp. 23, 24.

CHAP. V.

the highly interesting dispute on the subject of the Mosaic "days," intimately connected with this of the "Creation," should be always carried on in the same calm and impartial spirit in which it was at first entertained by that late eminent Professor of Geology, Dr. Buckland. Though not himself disposed to adopt the wider acceptation of the term, he adds the opinion that "there is no sound critical or theological objection to the interpretation of the word 'day,' as meaning a long period;" but that there is "no necessity for such extension, in order to reconcile the text of Genesis with physical appearances, if it can be shown that the time indicated by the phenomena of geology may be found in the undefined interval following the announcement of the first verse." Of this same opinion we find Dr. Chalmers, Professor Sedgwick, &c., and moreover, "that the creation of the component matter of the earth and heavens having been announced in verse 1, the phenomena of geology, like those of astronomy, are passed over in silence, and the narrative proceeds at once to details of the actual creation which have more immediate reference to man."

2. Next follows the *order* in which "the Creation" is described as taking place. Here, it might be imagined, comes in at once the question of the six days. But this appears much too hastily assumed. May not the real clue to the order of God's works be something quite different?—something in-

dependent altogether of the six days?[1] Suppose that instead of six days, there had been only *one*,

[1] It is not at all intended by anything here remarked, to speak disparagingly of the interest that must ever be felt in the question as to the literal meaning of the "days," and whether they imply the natural periods so called, or those much longer ones which might answer to the formation of the great geological strata of the earth. We have, in fact, reserved the further discussion of this point to a later chapter. Following the authorities that have been already named, — Buckland, Chalmers, Sedgwick, — the *natural* theory has been ably supported in a pleasing manual on the subject by the Rev. James Gray, *The Earth's Antiquity in harmony with the Mosaic Record of Creation.* He takes the view, "that the first verse in Genesis is not to be understood according to the currently entertained notion, as merely giving a summary account of the *after*-recorded work of the six days, but is an independent proposition, enunciating THE CREATION, primordial as to time,—the reference being retrospective rather than prospective." It is not without satisfaction that we quote from this author the following eloquent tribute to the wonderful discoveries, and improved tone, of science in the present day:—"The philosophers of the present day are not, like too many of a former age, proud in their boast of an empty scepticism. Science has now disclosed *too much* to satisfy a truly enlarged mind with any agency less than Omnipotency; the arcana of Nature have been of late *too widely* laid open to allow any correctly reasoning powers to ascribe her operations — so various in action, yet so harmonious in design — to other than an Almighty Architect. The proud and sceptical spirit would seem now to be obliged to succumb under the potency of the Divine Majesty bearing down upon it from Nature's storehouses on every side; for while the telescope has brought to view wider and wider ranges of God's empire, and the microscope has unveiled the most hidden corners thereof, and each and every part has disclosed worlds of creation unknown before, the culminating point has been achieved by the delving instruments of the geologist. Penetrating with these into the earth's solid masses, he has manifested that, through time past immeasurable, worlds upon worlds of creations have been evolving upon our own little globe, and the majesty of the Eternal been displayed on successive surfaces of this earth during ages long anterior to its traverse by any human footsteps. Man therefore now, in this newly opened volume, has continually set before him a palpable memorial of the immensity of his God. 'The very stones' do indeed 'cry out,' and speak to him this voice."—Gray's *Antiquity of the Earth,* chap. iv. p. 211, second edition.

CHAP. V.

is there not still a broad scale laid down, which allows for any conceivable length of progress, however slow and orderly the stages of it might have been, and with whatever subordination to general laws impressed upon them from the beginning, they may have been carried on? We merely give the result, which we purpose tracing out more in detail in its proper place; but in the very assertion that God in the beginning "created *Heaven and Earth*," and observing, in the details which follow, that the scene is confined chiefly, if not wholly, to the "*earth*," the thought must needs be suggested of an immeasurable series of creative works. For that "Heaven" here means more than the "heaven" of verse 8 ("And God called the firmament heaven"), we think abundantly clear from the context in which it stands, and from comparison of other passages. "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the *heavens* are the works of Thine hands[1]; — "*Heaven* is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord."[2] "By the word of the Lord the *heavens* were of old, and the earth, standing out of the water and in the water."[3] No one will say that in these passages the term "heaven" is to be restricted to that outer firmament which is related (verse 6-8) to have been the work of the second day. It only remains, that

[1] Ps. cii. 25, quoted Heb. i. 11. [2] Is. lxvi. 1, quoted Acts, vii. 49. [3] 2 Pet. iii. 5.

we refer it to that glorious expanse of which the Psalmist exclaims[1], "When I consider thy *Heavens*, the work of Thy hands, the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man, that Thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that Thou regardest him?" Assigning, then, the same sense to the word in the passage before us, how marked is the transition which follows; when, having named this Heaven and the earth together, he now turns and confines himself to the *earth alone!* "And the *earth* was without form and void." But in what is omitted (and, as it seems, purposely omitted), we cannot help thinking what an infinite series of creative wonders might have been going on through all the antecedent, but unrecorded ages! If the structure of the heavens was in any degree as elaborate and measured in time and order, as that recorded of the earth in its last stage of preparation for man, what a wide and majestic field of contemplation opens out to our view in the simple announcement "God created the Heavens!" It was an ancient tradition of the Rabbis, that there were seven things created before the six days of Genesis; and a still more popular belief, that "the light" of the first day was no other than that of the sun itself.[2] Might they not with more

[1] Ps. viii. 3, 4.

[2] We may take thus early an opportunity of stating that visible luminosity, rather than the substantive form of the planets, perfectly answers the phenomenon recorded in the 3rd verse. Laplace declares the probability of the

CHAP. V.

reason have referred the sun to a still more ancient date? There seems nothing in the words of Moses to prevent our assigning a much more remote origin to the solar and other systems, than would appear on the surface of the account. Worlds upon worlds, and creations upon creations, rise up before the mind, as we pass that "Heaven" in review, which Moses couples in the same mention with the "earth." But because, as the place of our habitation, it more nearly concerns us than the other planets, he dismisses these and confines our attention to the earth alone, and all its furniture and inhabitants, with so much only of the disposition of the heavenly bodies as bears immediately upon ourselves. This, then, is the order. "Heaven and earth," *i. e.* the original and elementary matter of all things, is "created" first, probably in an instant of time:—"Heaven" itself, with the infinite number and variety of its orbs, with all its possible inhabitants and appurtenances, follows next,—each moulded, as the earth was afterwards in its season, according to the will of the great Creator:—next, the earth, sleeping, perhaps, for a time, in a semi-liquid form, through primeval ages of comparative vacuity, but eventually the seat of something noble and excellent in its kind; then passing through many a successive phase of animate and inanimate nature, till it becomes the appropriate residence of man. Here

existence in nature "of *opaque bodies* as considerable and probably in as great number as stars."—*Syst. d. Monde*, l. iv.

was the great scale and *order* of creation, to which is appended the much fuller detail of the six days' work,—a detail, however, not simply terminating in itself, but seeming also to reflect an important light upon antecedent epochs, somewhat similar in character, though less intimately related to the human species.

3. Among the more prominent passages in this last creation, is that where it is said, "Let there be light, and there was light." At its first formation there is every reason to think that the earth subsisted, as we have before observed, in a semi-liquid condition, a fiery fluid at the centre and boiling waters separated from the fire by a solid but slowly formed crust of rocky substance at the surface. From the strong internal heat hardening from below what was liquid above, would arise a dense seething of the superficial waters, a profound mistiness would envelope the earth, so as quite to destroy the reflecting power of our globe, and render it to the outward eye an almost opaque mass. Through how many ages this enveloping mist may have continued, we have not the least means of ascertaining. The clearing away of it, however, (whether we are to imagine this done once for all on the first of the six days, or whether such a clearance had from the beginning alternated with long periods of preceding darkness,) could only have been effected by a process indefinitely slow, or through the immediate interposition of Omni-

CHAP. V.

potence, by a fiat as absolute and wonderful, as though the light itself were then first called into being, and thrown upon a universe of primeval darkness. The act, therefore, is expressed in terms universally admired for their terse sublimity, nor could any have been found more thoroughly expressive, had it been intended to describe the original and actual creative word. And we see nothing lost to the dignity and sublimity of the expression, "Let there be light, and there was light."[1] In either view of it we may take further into consideration what is now discovered to be the constitution of the source of light to this earth, viz. of the *Sun*, whose light (supposing the body of it to have existed before) either then first struggled through the mist, or entered upon a new phasis of his shining. An alteration in the nebulous atmosphere, which is now understood to form the inner coat of the sun's atmosphere, might have been employed to produce this effect, and that, either singly by its own operation, or in conjunction with what has been just surmised to have been the condition of the earth's surface contemporaneously with it. By some such cause, or by the union of both, the phenomena in Genesis admit of a natural and easy solution. There is nothing in the expression[2], "there was light" (or

[1] A passage which excited the admiration of the heathen Longinus, who at the same time speaks of Moses as the Lawgiver of the Jews. See *Longinus de Sublim.* § ix.

[2] "I learn from Professor Pusey that the words, "Let there be

"light was"), that necessarily implies creation for the first time—any more than when it is said (for the words are precisely the same in the original, Gen. v. 5), "Evening was and morning was." In this latter connection they occur repeatedly throughout the chapter; and, as it is obvious that creation could not have been intended at *each repetition* of "evening and morning," so neither can we argue that it was necessarily intended in the earlier passages where the expression first occurs, whether at verse 5, or in the passage under our consideration and which first tells us "there was light." [1]

light" (Gen. i. 3), by no means necessarily imply that light had never existed before. They may speak only of the substitution of light for darkness upon the surface of this our planet. Whether light had existed before in other parts of God's creation, and had existed on this earth before the darkness described in ver. 2, is foreign to the purpose of the narrative."—*Buckland*, p. 26.

[1] It may not be uninteresting to fortify thus early our general position, by adducing the following illustrations from other works on Genesis. Gray, on verse 2 of Genesis, says: "Such a disturbed condition of terrestrial things is here narrated, as we should naturally conclude would be found after the violent action of one or other of those grand disturbing agents, either of fire by earthquakes, or of water by deluges, which we know to be Nature's ordinary mighty destroyers and renovators on the earth . . . a state following upon the *last* catastrophe anterior to the period of its Divinely recorded reorganisation for the abode of man."—*Earth's Antiquity*, pp. 120, 144. "Wrapped in its watery garment, and enveloped in thick darkness, without a living creature of the animal or vegetable world within its precincts, *a dark, untenanted, watery waste*, is the simple condition of our planet, when introduced to our notice in the book of Moses. . . . The tepid waters on its surface, occasioned by the central heat, at this early period of its existence must have sent up a constant stream or volume of vapour, which rested above the atmosphere, and acted as a screen between the sun and the earth, until dissolved by the gradual cooling down of the elements."—*M'Causland*, pp. 147, 192.

CHAP. V.

4. Though allusion has been already made to the next particular which seems worthy of observation, it may deserve a separate and distinct notice, viz. that the creation of the body of the sun, and indeed of its illuminating power, need not necessarily be deferred to the fourth day. If we reserve for the work of that day such a fresh modification of the light of the sun, as should make it serve the purpose there indicated, the description in the sacred narrative would seem sufficiently carried out. To this some have not unreasonably added the idea of a new rate of revolution of the earth, by which the days might have become shortened to their present dimensions, having previously, and during the slower rates of revolution, been of much longer duration. We should thus have a sufficient explanation of the fourth day, without having recourse to the almost untenable position of ascribing the actual creation of the great central orb in our planetary system to the work of that day.

5. We have already remarked upon the distinction between the terms "creating" and "making." But indeed it may be doubted, whether the work of creation ever ceased, till it placed man upon the stage, or whether it be not rather in exercise to the present day. It is the conclusion of the most eminent geologists, founded, as they consider it, on the undoubted indications of nature, that there

have been successive epochs of creation, separated by indefinite intervals of time, and marked and ushered in by phenomena of depression and elevation of the Earth's surface, when new forms of life, whether by sea or land, have appeared and flourished, till, by a similar catastrophe, these again have yielded to others which have flourished through the like long periods. They recognise such epochs, partly because of the enormous revolutions required to bring about and heap together the successive strata which form the crust of the earth, and partly from observing the continually shifting forms of animal and vegetable life by which those strata are distinguished. We see nothing in the text of Scripture to militate against such a conclusion. On the contrary, we start with the supposition that the detailed account in Genesis is that of the last adaptation of the soil and climate of the earth to the use and habitation of man; and we see no inconsistency in allowing room for many previous adaptations, according to the fashion and organism of the creatures who were in turn to occupy the terrestrial habitation. Our quarrel with geologists is not for pointing out the distinct traces of such epochs, but for ever hesitating to confess in each of them the manifest tokens of creative skill and power, similar in every respect to that recorded in Genesis as introductory to the formation of man. And how any one should deny

CHAP. V.

us the liberty of asserting more such creations[1] than one, because they are not actually recorded in Scripture, we confess ourselves unable to understand. There being *one* recorded instance of an entirely fresh disposition of the earth's surface, so far from precluding, rather tends to confirm the supposition of there having been others, of which no record remains, save the distinct traces which are discernible in the physical condition of the earth. We seem perfectly at liberty to entertain the belief that such epochs there really were, since the first creation of matter. Old creations might have perished, and been "emptied out" as it were, to make way for new. The earth thus "empty and void" for a time, and passing through its period of murky steam,—again at the bidding of the omnific Word, gave birth to the creatures best suited to its condition. If old species should reappear, intermixed with the new, it might either be by a fresh creative act, or by some succession kept up in places that might have escaped the general devastation. The new races would, however, predominate, and would continue to perform the parts assigned them till some new revolution again

[1] Quite in accordance with this view, we have the high authority of Sir R. Murchison for saying, "Geology, modern as she is among the sciences, has revealed to us, that during immeasureable periods, long anterior to the creation of the human race, and while the surface of the globe was passing from one condition to another, whole races of animals—all the groups adapted to the physical conditions in which they lived—*were successively created*, lived their appointed time, and perished."—*Murchison's Siluria*, ed. 3, p. 4.

swept them away. Each would in turn have issued from the parent earth, alike the work of the same great "Spirit," who from first to last "moved," — *i.e.* hovered with the watchfulness of parental care, "on the face of the waters." And the same terms would be applicable to each new phase of waste and of reconstruction, as are in fact applied by the sacred penman to that last revolution on the surface of our planet which issued in the creation of man. "The earth was without form [empty] and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." [1]

[1] When great geologians have been contented to see in Genesis the non-recognition of their science, while at the same time they find certainly *no contradiction* to it, others may at least wait in patience till greater light can be thrown upon the subject. Professor Sedgwick nobly remarks: "*The Bible instructs us,* that man, and other living things, have been placed but a few years upon the earth, and the physical monuments of the world bear witness to the same truth. If the astronomer tells us of myriads of worlds not spoken of in the sacred records, the geologist, in like manner, proves (not by arguments from analogy, but by the incontrovertible evidence of physical phenomena) that there were former conditions of our planet, separated from each other by vast intervals of time, during which man, and the other creatures of his own date, had not been called into being. Periods such as these belong not, therefore, to the moral history of our race, and come neither within the letter nor the spirit of revelation. Between the first creation of the earth and that day in which it pleased God to place man upon it, who shall dare to define the interval? On this question Scripture is silent; but that silence destroys not the meaning of those physical monuments of His power that God has put before our eyes, giving us at the same time faculties whereby we may interpret them, and comprehend their meaning."—*Studies of the University.*

6. And if this be the true account, it is a question whether the condition of the earth, immediately antecedent to the creation of man, or indeed during any of the preceding intervals, can properly be termed a "chaos." Periods there may have been when mighty convulsions disturbed the face of nature; but a prevalent order and regularity seems to have been the general law throughout. Of all that He "created," as well as of all that He "made," it is emphatically pronounced, "God saw that it was good." Or if this be too refined a distinction, we find a juster and more convincing argument in the orderly deposits of the most ancient strata, in the testimony given by the whole fossil tribe, as to the suitability of the earth's condition to the varying forms of life which from time to time have prevailed on its surface. Thus, like the atoms of Epicurus, we may banish chaos (in the common sense of the term) to the regions of poetry and mythology, and claim for every successive condition of the globe which we inhabit, an orderly obedience to the laws impressed upon its material elements, and conformable to the stage of vegetation and to the species of animal life for which the particular period was intended to serve.

7. It is not agreed among geologists, what phenomena in the fossil-world may be due to the general Flood recorded in Genesis, and what to the original stratification of the earth, brought about by the successive revolutions of its surface. When

attention was first called to geological inquiries in the last century, it was at first thought that the fossil remains of beasts and fishes, and other petrified substances entombed in the earth, were all traceable to the effects of the Deluge. When it was seen that the highest mountains were strewed with pebbles and shells of clearly marine origin,—when the bones of the hyæna, the tiger, the rhinoceros, and various other creatures of tropical climates were found, as at Kirkdale, embedded and scattered about in caves of much higher latitudes than those they naturally inhabit,—the conclusion seemed at first sight inevitable, that they had been washed there at a time when a great flood of waters overspread the earth; and the phenomena were hailed as fresh evidences that "the waters had exceedingly prevailed, and all the high hills that were under the whole heavens were covered."[1] This idea seemed supported by the concurrent observations of other philosophers, who saw traces of enormous currents having set in from the south, and swept in a north-easterly direction over the continents of Asia and Europe. *Reinhold Foster*, who accompanied Captain Cook in his second voyage round the world, sought thus to account for the peculiar configuration of all the continents of the Old World; and, observing how their sides were hollowed out into vast gulfs on the west, and their coasts or edges left pointed and

[1] Gen. vii. 9.

CHAP. V.

precipitous on the south, he thought that it was caused by "a great cataclysm coming from the south-west: that the waters of the ocean, dashing with violence against the barrier which the continents opposed to them, ground away their sides with fury, scooped out the deep gulfs open towards the south-west, swept off all the movable earth from the southern side, and left nothing standing but those rocky points, which were only parts of the skeleton. The islands on the east might be only the accumulated ruins of this great catastrophe, or the fragments of the continent protected from total destruction by the jutting point which received the first shock."[1] Another celebrated geographer[2] accounted in the same way for the vast plains of Siberia and the north, and that they were composed of the earth washed up and accumulated by strong currents from the south, after their fury had been spent upon the Himalaya, or the great table land of Asia. And it was thus he explained the presence in Siberia of fossil elephants, and of mammoths, and a multitude of other animals and plants which live at the present day only under the sky of the tropics. *Dr. Hales*, and many learned writers of his day, eagerly adopted the hypothesis. It is no disparagement to the learning or abilities of those eminent writers of the last century, to say that

[1] See Guyot's *Earth and Man*, ch. ii.

[2] Pallas, born 1741.

further observations have led to a somewhat different account of the phenomena which thus engaged their attention. "Seductive as this idea is at the first glance," observes the author[1] just quoted, "it is scarcely necessary to say, that much which modern geology has taught us upon the structure of the mountains, their rise and the composition of the soil, forbids us to adopt it. It dates from a time when the mind, struck for the first time with the revolutions of the globe, of which it saw the traces everywhere, found no force sufficiently powerful to bring them about; and when water, in particular, seemed the only agent to which recourse could be had to explain them." While, however, we abandon these supposed evidences of the Flood, they by no means cease to be of value as throwing important light on the Scripture record. The very fact of such currents having ever occurred, and having left indelible marks of their track—the passage of large deposits of earth, rocks, and other materials, rolled along over the plains now elevated into mountains, or sunk into valleys and lakes, is an instance in observed nature which harmonises well with the Scripture account of a similar catastrophe and convulsion of the elements at the time of the Flood. It confirms also the foregoing supposition of alternating periods of waste and revival. In the Flood

[1] *Earth and Man*, ch. ii.

CHAP. V.

itself, the scene of devastation was indeed the effect of the Divine displeasure at the aggravated impiety of men; but the instruments employed were no other than those same natural agents to which the other observed effects are ascribed, and whose action at some remote period of time in breaking up the existing face of things is thus exhibited in fact, and must therefore necessarily be admitted. It has not been pretended by geologists to explain in what exact manner the successive changes and revolutions on the earth's surface, which are distinctly observable, have been brought about; nor how it was that the creatures of one period were put an end to, and their fossil remains imbedded in the ground, to be trodden under foot by those who came after;—but it may safely be contended that the Flood was an instance on actual record, of at least *one* disturbing force, adequate to produce such result, and which made a clear sweep, so to speak, with the exception of the one family in the ark, of all the existing generations of animal life. And when we behold the traces of new life and the commencement of new strata following, at whatever interval, upon such temporary devastation; we have an instance before our eyes of what the Theist is so anxious to deny, viz. that the Deity *has* interfered at divers periods, with his own creation, and has *not* left it to be carried on with blind uniformity by the spontaneous action of general laws.

And again, whether we date man from the creation, or trace the various families to their second origin, as it were, at the flood, when only one family survived—the case as to the comparatively recent origin of our race is not materially altered. To deny the flood is not to get rid of the recent formation of mankind, unless it can be shown that the period from Adam to Noah was of indefinite length, and not the nine generations recorded in Genesis; and that man had existed from time immemorial upon the earth; but this has never yet been proved, and all appearances go quite to the contrary. Human remains are not found among the earlier vestiges of creation at all; nor even in the more recent alluvial deposits are they found in any such proportion as to justify the assumption in question.[1] And yet, if this assumption were true, we might undoubtedly expect, among the other relics of bygone ages, not merely the remains of the human inhabitant, but of the habitations themselves, the cities and the houses where he dwelt and flourished. "It would seem probable," remarks Bishop Berkeley, "that guns, medals, and implements in metal and stone, might have lain entire, buried under ground forty or fifty thousand years, if the world had been so old. How comes it, then, that no remains are found, no antiquities of those numerous ages preceding the Scripture accounts of time; that no fragments

[1] See Ch. VII. Appendix, Note I.

CHAP. V.

of buildings, no public monuments, no intaglios, statues, basso-relievos, medals, inscriptions, utensils, or artificial works of any kind are ever discovered, which may bear testimony to the existence of those mighty empires, those successions of monarchs, heroes, and demi-gods, for so many thousand years?"[1] Or, to quote from a learned geologian of our own day, "Many signs of the agency of man would have lasted at least as long as the shells of the primitive world, had our race been as ancient."[2] And from another, "Had any creature in the likeness of Adam trod the earth during the deposition of the stratified deposits, his form and works must have been traced in as legible characters on the framework of our globe, as the forms of those plants and animals which have been exhumed in such abundance by the practical geologist."[3]

While speaking of the deluge we will only further notice, that whatever difficulties may occur in accounting for the recorded phenomena — difficulties as to the supply of water necessary to drown the whole inhabitants of the earth, as to the number of beasts in the ark, or how they were provided with food; these and such like difficulties are nothing to those which are presented to us in the whole field of geological research, and which the utmost ability of the most learned and assiduous investigators of nature has failed entirely to remove.

[1] Berkeley's *Minute Philosopher.*

[2] Lyell, *Principles of Geology.*

[3] M'Causland, p. 208.

How the flints got in between the chalk;—by what process of fusion it came about, that in the composition of both of them there should be contained the same species of shells;—the whole history of the quiet injection of so many myriads of fishes, insects, and animals, with liquid matter dissolved from rocky or mineral masses:—these, and many similar phenomena, though the results are visible to the eye, are extremely hard to conceive of as to the manner of operation. Yet, till these things be satisfactorily explained, it is vain to throw all the difficulty on the Scripture-side, with the sole view of discrediting the whole narrative of the earlier chapters of Genesis, and of denying in particular the recent origin of man, and the unity of the several races in the one common head assigned to them by Moses in his account of the creation. Every day, amid the rapid strides that science is making, we are compelled to witness phenomena which we cannot understand. And it is too much, because of similar incomprehensibility, to reject accounts which, like those in Scripture, are supported by an amount of independent evidence to which there is nothing equal for any other writings.

Supposed causes of great physical disturbances on the surface of the earth.—Nothing has more puzzled the geologist than to account for the agencies by which the successive changes in the earth's surface, as well as the displacement of older species of plants and animals and their replacement by new ones, were effected; or to explain in what manner the sudden extinction and interment of whole worlds of animate life was brought about.

CHAP. V.

Sir Charles Lyell notoriously refers these phenomena to the slow and gradual operation of natural causes, such as we see at work every day. Hitchcock ascribes these changes to gradual elevations and depressions of land, causing immense revolutions in climate. "Such animal and vegetable existences," he says, "have from time to time been placed upon the earth as were adapted to its varying conditions. When the earliest group was created, such were the climate, the atmosphere, the waters, and the means of subsistence, that the lower tribes were best adapted to the condition of things. That group occupied the earth till such changes had occurred as to make it unsuited to their natures, and consequently they died out, and new races were brought in, not by mere law, but by Divine benevolence, power, and wisdom. These tribes also passed away, when the condition of things was so changed as to be uncongenial to their natures, to give place to a third group, and these again to a fourth, and so on to the present races, which, in their turn, perhaps, are destined to become extinct."—*Religion of Geology*, Lect. ix. And again: "In the earliest times in which animals and plants lived, the climate over the whole globe appears to have been as warm as, or even warmer than, it is now between the tropics. And the slow change from warmer to colder appears to have been the chief cause of the successive destruction of the different races; and new ones were created better adapted to the altered condition of the globe: and yet each group seems to have occupied the globe through a period of great length; so that we have here another evidence of the vast cycles of duration that must have rolled away, even since the earth became a habitable globe."—*Religion of Geology*, Lect. i. The like opinion is expressed by Sir Charles Bell, viz.: "That the earth was suited at one time to the scaly tribe of the lacertæ, with languid motion; at another, to animals of a higher organisation, with more varied and lively habits; and finally, that at any period previous to man's creation, the surface of the earth would have been unsuitable to him. Any other hypothesis than that of a new creation of animals suited to the successive changes in the inorganic matter of the earth, the condition of the water, atmosphere, and temperature, brings with it only an accumulation of difficulties."— *On the Hand,* Bridgewater Treatise, iv. p. 27.

Dr. Whewell, in his *History of the Inductive Sciences*, has examined the opposite theories of the "doctrine of catastrophes," and that which refers the changes to the uniform operation of natural laws acting over very long periods. After carefully balancing between them, he shows demonstrably that there is no *à priori* probability, as seems once to have been imagined, in favour of the doctrine of uniformity, however adequate it may be to account for many phenomena which, by an equal mistake on the other side, seemed at first accountable for only by the supposition of violent and sudden forces let loose, as it were, upon the world. The same author, in another place, where he again reviews these opposite hypotheses, thus applies the argument to the Scripture account of things: "The last great event in the history of the vegetable and animal kingdoms was that by which their various tribes were placed in their present seats. And we may form various hypotheses with regard to the sudden or gradual manner in which we may suppose the distribution to have taken place. We may assume that at the beginning of the present order of things, a stock of each species was placed in the vegetable or animal province to which it belongs, by some cause out of the common order of nature; or we may take a uniformitarian view of the subject, and suppose that the provinces of the organic world derived their population from some anterior state of things by the operation of natural causes. Nothing has been pointed out in the existing order of things which has any analogy or resemblance of any valid kind to that creative energy which must be exerted in the production of a new species. And to assume the introduction of new species as a part of the order of nature, without pointing out any natural fact with which such an event can be classed, would be to reject creation by an arbitrary act. Hence, even on natural grounds, the most intelligible view of the history of the animal and vegetable kingdoms seems to be that each period which is marked by a distinct collection of species forms a cycle; and that, *at the beginning of each such cycle, a creative power was exerted*, of a kind to which there was nothing at all analogous in the succeeding part of the same cycle. If it be urged that in some cases the same species, or the same genus, runs through two geological formations which must, on other grounds, be referred to different cycles of creative energy,

CHAP. V.

we may reply that the creation of many new species does not imply the extinction of all the old ones. Thus we are led by our reasonings to this view, that the present order of things was commenced by an act of creative power entirely different to any agency which has been exerted since. None of the influences which have modified the present races of animals and plants since they were placed in their habitations on the earth's surface, can have had any efficacy in producing them at first. We are necessarily driven to assume, as the beginning of the present cycle of organic nature, an event not included in the course of nature. And we may remark that this necessity is the more cogent, precisely because other cycles have preceded the present."—Whewell, *Indications of the Creator*, pp. 161, 162. A passage will be quoted in a subsequent chapter, from which it will appear, that Sir John Herschel would ascribe the phenomena in question to certain modifications of the *solar heat and atmosphere*, rather than to mere changes of level affecting the temperature on the surface of the earth. (See Chap. VI. p. 177; and Herschel, *Outlines of Astronomy*, § 830.)

CHAP VI.

The Mosaic Order of Creation.

"A god alone can comprehend a God;
Man's distance how immense! On such a theme
Nothing can satisfy but what confounds;
Nothing but what astonishes is true."

Young.

. . . . "Deum namque ire per omnes
Terrasque tractusque maris, cœlumque profundum;
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum . . .
. . . Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet."

Virg. *Georg.* 4; *Æn.* 6.

LET us turn now to the sacred text itself. The part which concerns the present subject is from Gen. i. 1, to Gen. ii. 8. And in what we shall offer by way of commentary, it is our purpose not to be guided solely by those who have laboured in this field since geology brought forward its peculiar difficulties, but to take carefully into account the earlier and more independent authorities as well. Many ingenious modes of reconciling the text of Scripture with the facts of geological science have of late years been suggested. We would mention with all respect and gratitude the labours of those excellent men, who came forward

CHAP. VI.

when the citadel of our faith appeared to be in danger, at once to vindicate the authority of Scripture, and to reconcile it with the new discoveries of science. But after all our endeavours to follow [1] what is so ably advanced by this class of writers, there remains often an uncomfortable impression on the mind, that had it not been for the necessity of accounting for certain visible phenomena, many new meanings would never have occurred which now we find proposed as the natural sense of Scripture. It will therefore be the aim of the following chapters to show that the received facts of geology are not only compatible with the text of Scripture as interpreted by a modern school of expositors, but with known interpretations of it, before the discoveries of geology were heard of, and before they could have had any influence upon the opinions of those who wrote. [2]

Gen. i. 1. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

The word "beginning," whether taken in a relative or an absolute sense, must needs in this place have a very wide and indefinite meaning. For though in the relative use of it, the term would be restricted by the subject in hand; as

[1] The reader may consult Hitchcock, *Religion of Geology* (containing almost all the newest views); J. Pye Smith, *On the Relation between the Scriptures and Geology.*

[2] Certain opinions of the fathers may be here referred to,—see *note,* Chap. V. See also a *Catena* of expositions in Gray, *Earth's Antiquity,* Appendix to Chap. III.

when we read in the Gospels, "He which made them at the *beginning* made them male and female,"[1] we refer naturally to the subject in hand, and finding it "marriage," the "beginning" becomes at once restricted to the time of man's own creation; yet the subject in Genesis being a much wider one, viz. the entire creation, and the whole compass of "heaven and earth," — by the same rule we claim for the term "beginning" a scope as wide as the subject itself, and refer it to a period as indefinite and remote as the imagination can conceive—the *first moment of time* as measured by the first act of creation. We think this the only meaning compatible with the context, and with other places of Scripture. But to make the words a mere preface to the six days' work, and as though all the particulars were soon to follow, of what is here summed up under the general phrase "created in the beginning" — is to empty it of all sublimity and grandeur — to say nothing of the incoherency of a statement which would make a beginning from two things at once, "heaven *and* earth." One of these surely must have stood at "the beginning," and not both, if the "beginning" was merely meant for the first stage of the proceedings shortly after detailed. Passing by this interpretation then of the term, as insipid and irrelevant, we confirm our own sense of it by comparing, among other passages the following:

[1] Matt. xix. 4.

CHAP. VI.

"The Lord possessed me in the *beginning* of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. . . . . Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth. . . . . When He prepared the heavens I was there, when He set a compass upon the face of the depth" (Prov. viii. 22, 23, 25, 28). It is the very impossibility of conceiving definitely the idea of time and of its beginning, which throws into stronger relief and prominence that which we doubt not is here the main idea, viz. the assertion that God Himself was the true and only Creator of all. The stress is evidently here, that at what time soever the things were made, and of whatsoever number and variety, in "heaven and in earth," they consist, the great God of Israel was the Maker of them all. "Heaven and earth" thus include all things[1] whatever. It is not merely "the firmament" of verse 8, that is meant by "Heaven;" but, as we before showed, the whole expanse of the stars and celestial bodies, with all their supposable inhabitants and appurtenances. And it is to teach us that in no other way, were all these and everything in them, and in our own world, originally made, than by the sovereign will and power of the One Almighty Creator; and that, at a time or times utterly unknown,

[1] *Cœlum et terram.* Intellige omnes terrestres et cœlestes creaturas. — *Fagius*; *Vetablus*; *Lyra*; *Estius.* Mundum universum.— *Picherellus,* who compares Gen. ii. 1, Ps. xxxiii. 6.

perhaps unintelligible by us[1], "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." And now, as we advance in this record of creation, we begin insensibly to substitute our own preconceived ideas for the plain account of Moses. Most readers are so familiar with this chapter of Genesis, that it scarce occurs to them to question the correctness of the impressions which they have long associated with it; and it almost disturbs their faith, to depart in the least from their customary acceptation of its meaning. The scene they have pictured to themselves may be somewhat as follows:—First, a wild primitive sea of chaos, tossing

[1] "Quo extiterunt initio cœlum et terra, eo Deus illa creavit," is the close rendering of *Picherellus.* "In the beginning" was somewhat fancifully, perhaps, interpreted by some of the Fathers to express the agency of Christ in the work of creation, who is the true "beginning." *Ita Christum* Gen. i. 1, *vocari tradunt* Origenes, Basilius, Hieronymus, Augustinus, Beda, *ut sit sensus,* "In principio," *i.e.* in Filio Dei *creavit Deus cœlum et terram: verum rectius statuit* Ambrosius lib. i. Hexem.: c. 6. *intelligi principium temporis:* sc. *materiæ, loci adeoque rerum omnium creatarum,*—Leigh. *Crit. Sac.* ad voc רֵאשִׁיתׄ. The parallel expression in St. John's Gospel, which was probably the last book in the sacred canon, with this in Genesis, the first book, is certainly remarkable. "In the *beginning* was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." It should be noted, however, that while the expression in Genesis denotes that all things had a beginning in time, viz. when God created them, there is no such ascription of a beginning to our blessed Lord in St. John. "In the beginning," he tells us, "*was* the Word," not "was created." The Greek marks it strongly by the word ἦν (which compare with the ἐγένετο of Genesis, ver. 3, &c.), expressing an existence already begun, and going on even when nothing else existed save Deity Himself:—much more, then, in the comparatively late "beginning" of creation itself,—*He* "*was,*" who is the Eternal "*I AM*" (see John viii. 58); "the A and Ω the First and the Last."—Rev. i. 11.

CHAP. VI.

in unruly agitation; then suddenly at the same voice which "rebuked the winds and the sea, and there was a great calm," a new condition of order and beauty; whence immediately arose the beauteous and orderly frame of the earth; light for the first time sprang out of darkness—the shades of evening gave place to the first dawn of morning, and the day appeared. On following days, by a similar process, both vegetable and animal life was first called into existence; fruits and vegetables were the earliest products, then, after two days' interval, birds, fishes, then again, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind, till we come on the sixth day to man himself; the interval of the fourth day is occupied by the creation of the sun, moon, and planets, and of all the stars of heaven. Such might be, and often is, imagined to be the opening scene in Genesis. But now, so far from all things having sprung immediately from a primitive chaos of boisterous and jarring elements; science will tell us that, no sooner was matter created, than it was subject to general laws, by the gradual operation of which successive changes took place. So far from the light being wholly unknown, or birds, beasts, and fishes being never seen till the day when order thus for the first time succeeded to disorder, and light to primeval darkness;—her doctrine, gathered from many clear intimations of nature, is, that ages upon ages had rolled along, and revolution

after revolution had occurred on the surface of the earth, each witnessing some new race of inhabitants, and some new forms of vegetable life, before the æra which brought man upon the stage. Light, it would appear by the same investigations of science, must have contributed its share to the maintenance of life, and to the support of the various organisms and their specific functions during all those antecedent periods. The sun, too, very probably subsisted in his orbit, and, most certainly, the stars, which are distant suns, and from many of which our little earth must be wholly invisible. So far from the fishes and fowls being wholly separated, by perhaps a considerable interval from the first plants and trees, indications are found that the first terrestial plants were coeval with the first fishes, and that many sea weeds, and many specimens of the zoophyte tribe, during enormous periods, preceded both. And however we may stretch the sense of "day," it does not seem entirely to remove most of these apparent discrepancies between the conclusions of science and the relation in Genesis. The question then arises, Is our geology at fault? or our astronomy? or our theology? We answer none. For here, in this immeasurable period from "the beginning," we find time sufficient to allow for all existing phenomena that cannot otherwise be explained. This awful gulf is, as it were, spanned and bridged over by the supposition of innumerable worlds then starting into

CHAP. VI.

existence, in orderly though unknown succession. There is indeed no record of their birth in history. Such records, we may reverently believe, would have been impossible, even if expedient or useful. They would far have exceeded any power of man to register, or any compass of books to contain. But our ignorance as to the facts does not preclude the reasonableness of the supposition — we might almost say, its *necessity*, in order to harmonise our ideas of God's immensity and eternity with the range in time and space of his created works. It is something to know, that there is nothing in this first verse of Genesis, but what assists and harmonises with this belief. The myriads of suns and planetary systems which stud the sky, must have had a beginning, and we find that beginning here.[1] But to confine ourselves at present to the

[1] It is finely remarked by the learned Dr. Hales, "Whether 'the host' of the fixed stars were all 'created and made' at the same time with our system, may reasonably be doubted. For though all these had *a beginning*, it is no where explicitly stated in Scripture that they had *the same beginning;* and the first philosophy, in the days of Job, plainly intimates that 'the morning stars' (by a beautiful figure representing the angels of light) were prior to that creation which they celebrated with hymns of joy. Modern telescopic discoveries, as they have augmented the number of stars that are invisible to the naked eye immensely, leading us to conclude that there are infinite numbers far beyond our ken, utterly undiscoverable, so they demonstrate the immense distances even of the largest and nearest, and lead us also to conclude, that these can be no other than *suns*, shining with native light, and from analogy, attended with suitable trains of planets, furnished, like ours, with inhabitants adapted to each, compared with which our whole system shrinks into insignificance. Is it then to be imagined for a moment, that the whole 'spangled heavens, a shin-

world which we inhabit. Professor Sedgwick states, "We are certain that there have been great successive changes in the surface of the earth—that some of these changes were slow and gradual—that others were brought about by the sudden eruption of the pent-up powers of nature, and were comparatively rapid and violent; but each a prelude to the material conditions which followed, till physical nature became what she now is."[1] Time sufficient for all these changes, so well attested and established on the face of the earth, is supplied from those immeasurable ages which stretched along from the mystic "beginning" to which the sacred record points back. In perfect consistency with this idea is also the *second* verse in Genesis. We have here, too, room to satisfy the speculations of geologists.

Gen. i. 2. "And the earth was without form and void: and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

It is best, perhaps, to take all the clauses of this verse together, though something might be gained to the geological side of the argument, by treating them as descriptive of quite separate periods. To

ing frame,' were called into existence merely 'to give light upon the earth,' which would be absolutely invisible from the nearest? or that the universe, which is found to be infinite or boundless, was not created until so lately as seven or eight thousand years ago?"—Hales, *Analysis*, vol. i. p. 313.

[1] Sedgwick, *Studies of the University of Cambridge*, Preface to 5th Edition, p. ccxviii.

CHAP. VI.

waive this advantage, however, we may observe, first, the marked transition, where the writer passes from the mention of "heaven and earth" together, to that of the "earth" alone: "And *the earth* was without form and void." In speaking of these words as helping out the supposition of a long duration prior to the earth assuming its present superficial form, we may at least say, they indicate a condition, towards which the elements of nature had apparently been long working up, and in which they continued working, till at last a new crisis sets in, expressed in the last words of the verse to which we shall come next. It is probable, too, that after the first creation of all material elements, things were left for the most part, to the operation of natural causes; and this necessarily implies a slow and gradual progress over large spaces of time. As regards the words themselves, "without form and void," the expression seems plain, but it is not so easy to form a clear conception of the meaning. The Chaldee version has it, "empty and waste;" the Syriac, "waste and uncultivated;" the Greek, "dark and unfurnished." "Without inhabitants, without produce;"[1] "without produce, and with no aptitude to produce;"[2] "without plants, without animals;"[3]—such are the glosses of different interpreters. Of these, the Greek version[4] trenches

[1] Ainsworth.
[2] Piscator.
[3] Estius; Tremellius.
[4] Adopted by M'Causland, who well translates, "*a dark, untenanted, watery waste*"—"*dark,*

somewhat upon what follows in the next clause, viz. "And *darkness* was upon the face of the deep." In a former chapter, the condition of the earth's atmosphere, answering to this description of "darkness," was fully explained. It was shown not necessarily to imply the non-existence of the light of the sun, or at least of his substance; but to have been due partly to agencies affecting the earth's atmosphere, and partly to similar conditions in that of the sun. While the sun was regarded by astronomers as itself an orb of fire, it might have been difficult to imagine any considerable diminution of light from that source, supposing it to have been already in existence, as we shall see reason presently to believe that it was. But after the discoveries of *Herschel* as to the true nature of the sun's constitution, and that his light is due to a luminous atmosphere, underlying which is another dense atmosphere of clouds, it becomes far more easy to conceive any possible shades of variety in the degree of luminosity from that source. *Sir John Herschel* says, "Geology testifies to the fact of extensive changes having taken place at epochs of the most remote antiquity in the

inasmuch as it was covered with vapour, and enveloped in the 'darkness that was on the face of the deep'—*untenanted*, inasmuch as no organic forms of plants and animals had yet been called into being."—*Sermons on Stones*, p. 147. "*Not* a chaotic state, in which the elements of darkness and light, and all other things, are commingled in an abyss called the 'deep,' but a temporary obscuration and a temporary desolate and waste condition."—Gray, *Earth's Antiquity*, pp. 143-149.

CHAP. VI.

climate and temperature of our globe — changes difficult to reconcile with the operation of second causes, such as a different distribution of sea and land, but which would find an easy and natural explanation in a slow variation of the supply of light and heat afforded primarily by the sun itself." [1]

But we are not suffered to dwell long on this condition of dull inert stagnation, with darkness all around. We are wakened by the stirring announcement, "And the Spirit of God moved [2] upon the face of the waters." By the "Spirit," in this place, some ancient Jewish expositors understood, as we are informed by Bishop Patrick, "a strong wind;" others, "the sun, which gives spirit and life to all things:" but the current of later interpretation tends (we should say more correctly) to spiritualise the words, and to understand no less than, as the learned prelate says, "the infinite wisdom and power of God, which made a vehement commotion and fermentation upon the fluid mass,

[1] Herschel's *Outlines of Astronomy*, § 830, ed. v. "An obscuration, extending for many thousand miles, has oftentimes been recorded in our own day, as the result of recent volcanic eruptions; and especially when volcanic force has upheaved the bottom of the sea, vapours dense, continuous, and vast in extent, have suffused such large portions of space, as to have obscured, for a long period, the sun from view."—*Earth's Antiquity*, p. 118. "Clouds above the firmament must have shut out the sun from the earth's surface." —*M'Causland*, p. 192.

[2] Or rather, "brooded upon the waters as a hen doth upon her eggs."—*Patrick.* See again Deut. xxxii. 11, "fluttereth over her young." Heb. מְרַחֶפֶת. *Picherellus in Cosmopœâ*, apud Poli Synops. "The expression seems intended to convey the first act of the creation of life, the pouring of vitality into the waters. Comp. Ps. civ. 29, 30."—*M'Causland.*

to separate the parts one from the other."[1] Thus far, as regards the agent: as regards the work, we may look upon it as a transition-state in creation, a terminal stage of preparation for a new creative epoch. What forms of life may have existed and flourished during the earth's condition as a watery abyss, we are not informed; nor how long it continued in that condition. The last-mentioned commentator says, "How long all things continued in mere confusion, before the light was extracted out of it, we are not told. It might be, for aught that is here revealed, a great while; and all that time, the mighty Spirit was at work, disposing, preparing, and ripening every part of it for such productions as were to appear successively in such spaces of time as are here and afterwards mentioned by Moses; who informs us, that after things were so digested and made ready (by long fermentations, perhaps) to be wrought into form, God produced every day for six days, some creature or other, till all was finished."[2] Till we know, to a greater certainty, exactly what happened, or how far this mention of a dark and desert condition of the earth

[1] Add those many passages in Holy Scripture, where creative agency is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, as Job. xxvi. 13, Ps. xxxiii. 6, civ. 30.

[2] Patrick ad *Gen.* i.5. The case is clearly and forcibly stated by Bishop Gleig as follows: "Moses records the history of the earth only in its present state. He affirms, indeed, that it was created, and that it was 'without form and void,' when 'the Spirit of God' began to move on the face of the fluid mass, but he does not say how long that mass had been in the state of chaos, or whether it was, or was not, the wreck of some

CHAP. VI.

was spoken relatively or absolutely, we are not entitled to conclude that all was mere chaos and confusion. We may rather picture to ourselves very similar scenes to what even now appear,—not, perhaps, the same order, nor the same perfection nor variety of forms,—certainly nothing approaching to the higher orders of the animal creation, still less to man himself. Just as where "heaven" is mentioned at verse 1, the fitting up of it with the heavenly host, and with all the beauteous stars of light, is left unrecorded; so here, perhaps, with the mere mention of creative influence at work, the

former system, which had been inhabited by living creatures of different kind from those which occupy the present. We read in various places of Scripture of a *new heavens* and a *new earth* to succeed the present earth and visible heavens, after they shall again be reduced to chaos by a general conflagration, and there is nothing in the books of Moses positively affirming that there was not an *old earth* and *old heavens*, or, in other words, a former planetary system, composed of the same matter with the present, before it was reduced to that chaotic state in which Moses represents it as having been when the Spirit of God began to move on the face of the waters. . . . If philosophers have really discovered fossil bones that belonged to species and genera of animals which now nowhere exist, and if the destruction of these genera and species cannot be accounted for by the general deluge or any other known catastrophe, or if strata be found which could not have been so disposed as they are but by the sea, or at least some watery mass remaining over them in a state of tranquillity for a much longer period than the duration of Noah's flood,—if these things be indeed well ascertained, . . . there is nothing in the sacred writings forbidding us to suppose, that they are the ruins of a former earth, deposited in the chaotic mass, of which Moses informs us that God formed the present system. How long," he adds, "it continued in such chaotic state it is vain to inquire; but if in that state it contributed to keep in their proper places the other systems of the universe, it served a very important purpose among the works of God."—Gleig, *Annotations on Stackhouse*, b. i. c. i.

record closes, but we are left to fill up the outline as best we may. And it may not be presumptuous to hope that the advance of science may more and more enable us to do so, while to Scripture we shall ever owe it, that we start with right ideas as to the *true and only source* of life; and that it is to the superintending hand of Omnipotence that all things owe their being. Who knows but that this very verse in Genesis may conceal in its abyss of waters the lapse of those very ages to which belonged the formation of the tertiary, and some, perhaps, of the secondary strata—those parts of the earth's crust which are coeval with the first appearance of animated forms?

We stop at this point, before proceeding to the "six days' work," to contemplate the advance thus far made in the relation. We believe it to contain stages in which the true wonder of the world's order consists, even more than in the mere six days' work which follows, and which may have been related in detail, chiefly because it more nearly concerns the immediate object in view, when the revelation or vision of it was made to Moses. We may distinguish then, up to verse 3, the following four or more separate periods.

1. "The beginning"—before all things.
2. When God "creates the heaven,"
3. And "the earth."
4. (*a.*) When "the earth is without form and void."

CHAP. VI.

(*b.*) When "darkness is upon the face of the deep."

(*c.*) When "the Spirit of God moves upon the face of the waters."

The shortness of the relation should not blind us to its comprehensiveness and variety. From speaking of the "heaven and the earth" together, in verse 1, the transition to the "earth" only, verse 2, is, as we have already observed, most marked and emphatic. As though he would say, "Of the heavens I omit to relate more, or of all the wonders of the sky, in the order of their several creations. And though I shall relate presently how the sun in its orbit (that orbit, perhaps, assigned it during some far more remote antecedent period), became tributary to the uses of man upon the earth, I pass over all particulars of its first creation, or of the creation of any of the heavenly bodies whatsoever, or yet of the angels, or whatsoever forms may fill up the vast regions of infinite space; and I confine myself now principally to the earth?" But though Moses thus limits himself, or rather was thus limited in the revelation which he received, who, without presumption, can venture to imagine that the account omitted was a mere nothing? and that we know all because he proceeds to tell us so much? Must we not rather think what hidden worlds of truth lie beyond the province here immediately revealed! and that in the particular relation given we do but touch on

the confines of universal truth!—enough only to impress upon us with awful solemnity, the one great ruling thought, that all things spring from one great original, the power, wisdom, and goodness of the one eternal Almighty Creator! And if the exposition, which is a very ancient one, of the words "heaven and earth" be true, as importing the materials or prime elements whereof these were afterwards formed and made up, what an endless flight of ages rushes upon the mind! For to take this earth alone, we see how from the mention of the matter of it, he proceeds to devote the whole remainder of this chapter, and part of the next to its actual making up and furnishing in its last and present phasis. What might not, then, have been the space required, had it been thought expedient to proceed in like manner, from the first mention of the materials of "heaven" to a proportionably minute specification of the several details of its glorious mechanism, as we may judge of it from those glorious orbs of light which irradiate before our very eyes the wide expanse of the nightly sky? Still more, if we had been minutely informed as to all antecedent phases and epochs of our own earth, and of the long series of revolutions which are traceable when we come to examine into its structure? If it should be thought that upon the theory which we have advocated, an undue preponderance is given to the six days' preparation for the coming of man into the world, we refer again to the main object of the

CHAP. VI.

whole revelation, which was to lead men up to the idea of the one all-presiding all-creating God, and to keep to the things which were of nearest interest and relation to himself. There may have been other reasons as well. It may be that in this recorded creation we see as in a glass the reflection of all other creations, though not recorded: — the Omnific Word alike operating in all and saying, "Let there be light, and there was light;"—"the Spirit" alike "moving upon the face of the waters;" —ruin and reparation alike succeeding each other in their destined order. The whole description in the sacred text, though not directly written with that purpose, indirectly at least, admits of an application to *all* creations and to *all* times;—God in all is to be glorified, and His hand confessed. In a geological point of view, the same effort of imagination by which we retrace the earth to its condition of a watery deep, suffices to realise the repetition of the same condition again and again, in previous stages of its existence. We come easily to picture to ourselves successive epochs of ruin and repair, of the incumbent flood, and of the emerging surface ready to receive a new race of inhabitants. Such an exercise stretches the imagination, it is true; but not more so than if we seek to trace the path of the comet, or to realise the distances of the fixed stars; while every such effort tends to deepen and exalt our impressions of the Divine Omnipotence.

We come now to the days of the last, or Adamite

creation, as recorded in Genesis, chap. i. v. 3 to chap. ii. v. 8.

First. *Chap.* I. *vv.* 3–5. *The first Day.*

v. 3. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light.

v. 4. "And God saw the light, that *it was* good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

v. 5. "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day."[1]

It was the opinion of the ancient Jewish commentators, that the "light" of this first day was no other than that of the sun itself, whose creation they refer to this day, reserving for the fourth some new development of the laws by which his light was regulated. Among the Fathers it was an

[1] Some translate, "And it was evening, and it was morning, *one day.*" Also at vv. 8, 13, 19, 23, the words might more correctly be translated, "*a* second, *a* third, *a* fourth, *a* fifth day;" while at v. 31 it is "*the* sixth day." See Benisch, *Translation of the Pentateuch.* Mr. M'Causland translates —"then evening was, then morning was, one day;" and comparing this with "the vision of the evening and morning," in Daniel, "we cannot but see," he observes, "that there is strong ground for the suggestion, that the whole scene was communicated to the sacred historian in a succession of visions, each separate one occupying an evening and a morning; that is to say, an intermediate night, the season of visions or dreams; and the transactions of it appearing to Moses to be comprised in the compass of a natural day, which is defined to be the period of light, though the realities of which it was the vision occupied many natural days and nights. The transactions of a dream are often compressed into the space of a few minutes; and on the same principle, the operations of the Divine Author of creation, which may have occupied a long series of years, may have been presented to Moses as the works of a single day."—*Sermons on Stones,* p. 125.

CHAP. VI.

open question, as we see by the commentary of the celebrated *Lyra*, who says, "the substance of the two greater luminaries mentioned on the fourth day was made on the first; but that which had before been rude and irregular, was set in more perfect order on the fourth day; it then received power to make its influence felt upon this inferior orb of the earth."[1] However this be, or whether the substance of the sun might not have been created earlier still; and whether the things recorded both of the first and fourth days, were not, alike, *successive adaptations* of the light of the sun, and of the earth's receptivity for the same, may well be made a question. Without repeating what has already been advanced at some length on this subject, we may observe the confirmation gained to our former argument by the words which follow this production of the light:—"And God divided the light from the darkness." The antecedent state having been one of murky mist, steaming off from the boiling and troubled surface of the earth, when there was no clear light by day, and when, possibly, a much higher extent of atmosphere served to refract some straggling portions of indistinct light by night; *now* at once the day becomes more distinctly day, and the night more distinctly night. The Creator

[1] Hebræi dicunt solem primo die creatum.—Poli Synops: ad *Gen.* i. 14. Substantia luminarium facta est primo die, sed quæ informis anteà fuerat, quarto die formata est; et tunc accepit virtutem influendi in hæc inferiora.—*Lyra.*

"*divided between* them,"[1] as it is in the Hebrew, *i.e.* by a more distinct and perfect boundary; altering and adjusting in the necessary proportions both the luminous power of the sun's atmosphere, and the receptive quality of the earth's.

We pass on to that which follows:—"And evening was, and morning was," (thereby making) "the first day." We take this to be a sufficiently close translation[2]; and the sense is, "that by some arrangement of the light, day and night were made to succeed each other with a constant regularity, approaching, more or less, to what at present takes place by the successive returns of the earth on her axis to the same meridian? But how are we to account for the so frequent assertion and repetition of this clause, "Evening was and morning was," during the whole six days' work, as at vv. 8, 13, 19, 23, 31? It would appear to have had a prospective allusion to the fourth day, *after* which, and after the adjustment of the sun's light, and of

[1] So the Hebrew literally signifies. "Thus," remarks Mr. Gray, "the darkness which was over the face of the deep became *partially* scattered; not indeed entirely; that was left for completion till the work of the fourth day, but sufficiently so to mark the revolution of time. And since this division between light and darkness, *i.e.* between day and night, necessarily indicates the fact of the revolution of the earth upon its axis, whereby the one was by the reflection of the solar rays caused to succeed the other; an unanswerable argument, hence, seems furnished for the prior existence of the sun: how otherwise could there be a first, second, and third day?"—*Earth's Antiquity*, p. 158.

[2] "Ita extitit, vespertino constans et matutino, primus dies."—*Picherellus.* "Vespere et mane primum diem constituerunt."—*Gatakerus.*

CHAP. VI.

the mutual motions of the earth and sun more nearly according to their present laws, it would have been but natural to expect this regular succession of night and day, so often insisted on throughout the chapter. But by this early mention of it, ver. 5, we learn that the effect was produced in the first instance, *independently* of the present laws of the sun's light. And thus it was intended to guard against the error to which mankind were already prone, of making the sun the author (as the Egyptians did their Osiris) of every created thing; whereas Moses here intimates it was not even the cause of the evening and morning, those constant phenomena of our world. The same care is observable (chap. ii. 5) to prevent attributing any originating power to the rain, or river-waters applied by tillage. From the account of Moses in the last-mentioned passage, it would appear that as there was an upgrowth of herbs and plants without the genial moisture of the rain, so in chap. 1, without the sun (*i.e.* without *the light* of the sun in its present intensity), there was in like manner the process of vegetation going on — "the earth bringing forth the grass of the field, and the flower and fruit of the tree" (see vv. 11, 12); and in further exemplification of the same principle, he now adds in the passage before us, that prior to the more recent modifications of the solar light, there were the same phenomena of night and day as have been since experienced.

Secondly. *Chap.* I. *vv.* 6–10. *The second Day.*

v. 6. "And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

v. 7. "And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which *were* under the firmament from the waters which *were* above the firmament: and it was so.

v. 8. "And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.

v. 9. "And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry *land* appear: and it was so.

v. 10. "And God called the dry *land* Earth; and the gathering together of the waters, called He Seas: and God saw that it *was* good."

The second day of creation is ushered in by the same words as the first, "And God said."[1] So at the end of the day we find, as at the end of the first, the parallel expression, "And God saw that it was good;"[2] by which same phrase, afterwards, the work of each day is similarly wound up. It might have seemed superfluous thus to pronounce a commendation on that which is clearly announced to be a Divine work;—which has made some excellent commentators observe, that

[1] Occurring *nine* times in the chapter, vv. 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26, 29.

[2] Occurring *seven* times, vv. 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.

CHAP. VI.

the words may rather signify in the Hebrew, "God *had provided* that it should be good:" *i.e.* had foreseen everything in the Divine Mind, before it was made; and consequently, when made, it answered perfectly to the Divine ideal, and "was good."[1] Perhaps, in the first saying, "God said," we may recognise the Divine *Word*, the Λόγος of St. John, at whose bidding all was executed; and in the second, the Divine *Spirit*, by whose wisdom all was contrived; for "by his *Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens." "By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the *breath* of his mouth."[2] Another and critical use has been made of the latter clause. By its usual occurrence *after* the work of all the following days, and its non-occurrence here till the end of ver. 10, it is taken to indicate the continuance of the second day's work down to that verse, and inclusive of it. We are thus led to embrace the separation of the dry land from the seas, together with the structure of the firmament, in the work of that second day. To the same time—since the description of ch. ii. can only be supplementary to that of ch. i.—we may refer the selection and preparation of the garden of Eden.

[1] Reminding us of a remark of Professor Sedgwick: "We believe that the past history of nature is consistent and coherent, and that before the creation of all worlds there was an *archetype* of nature in the prescient mind of God."—*Studies of University, Pref.*, p. ccxix.

[2] Job, xxvi. 13; Ps. xxxiii. 6, civ. 29, 30.

Its furnishing with trees, &c., would follow in their order in the next day's work, and with birds and beasts on the fifth day. It is better to bring the mention of them thus early into one view; as the sooner we accustom ourselves to compare closely the two chapters and observe the supplementary form (according to the frequent custom of Holy Scripture) of the description in the latter, the more we shall admire the admirable harmony, which apparently without design subsists between them; while at the same time our eyes become opened to observe, that under a very short account may frequently be concealed a much greater variety of particulars than would at first sight be imagined.

Some variety of opinions has been manifested among commentators, as to the meaning and extent of the "firmament" in this passage. The solid crystalline sphere of the ancient Hebrew interpreters has long since given way to the simple and boundless expanse of the air and upper regions of the sky.[1] To those who would extend it to the empyræum itself, or seat of the highest heavens, we think it a sufficient answer to refer to what was said on verse 2, where we remarked that Moses having started in verse 1 with the mention of the "heaven and the earth" together, expressly confines himself to the "earth" alone. The firma-

[1] "Firmamentum" denotat *expansionem.—Malvendus; Marcus; Piscator; Tremellius; Fagius; Vetablus. Diffusum corpus aeris.—Vetablus; Drusius. Aquas Empyræo quam proximas.* Quidam apud Patres. See above, note.

CHAP. VI.

ment, therefore, must be here the region of the clouds and higher atmosphere, extending at most to the whole planetary system to which this earth belongs.[1] So Bishop Patrick, "the region of the air is the *lower firmament*, and the ether the *higher firmament*, wherein the sun and the planets are seated."[2] The following is the sublime description of Job: "He bindeth up the waters in the clouds and the cloud is not rent under them." It is evident, however, that besides this earthly firmament, so to speak, there is the still wider expanse of heaven, those immeasurable regions of space which are the great theatre of innumerable worlds, whose distance causes them to appear to us as one great cloud of light, or as mere specks in

[1] Mr. Gray makes the following important observation:—"The bringing in the 'firmament' on the second day into the spaces vacated by the ascending vapours in no respect limits the expansion of this atmosphere to these localities, or indicates then its first creation, but yields admission for the prior circumambient flow of this necessary constituent of an ancient earth." And he quotes from Professor Bush (*Commentary in loco*):—"The sense of expansion is undoubtedly prominent in the use of the term; yet subordinate to this is the idea of a 'firmament,' or that which firmly supports an incumbent weight, as the atmosphere does the masses of watery clouds above. But since the aerial regions, by an illusion of the senses, *seem* to extend to the heavenly bodies, therefore the sun and moon and stars are said to be placed in the firmament, though, in reality, removed to immense distances beyond it. It is the usage of the Scriptures to describe the things of the natural world *as they appear*—as they strike the eyes of plain unlettered observers; accordingly, in former ages, before the true structure of the solar system was understood, the idea naturally suggested by the word 'firmament' was that of the *blue vault of heaven*. We now limit it to the atmosphere, or rather the region which it occupies."—*Earth's Antiquity*, pp. 161, 162.

[2] Patrick on *Gen.* i. 7.

the distant sky. And of this the Psalmist speaks, "Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment; who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain;" and Isaiah, "that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in."[1]

Thirdly, *Chap.* I. *vv.* 11—13. *The third Day.*

v. 11. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, *and* the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed *is* in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

v. 12. "And the earth brought forth grass, *and* herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed *was* in itself, after his kind: and God saw that *it was* good.

v. 13. "And the evening and the morning were the third day."

We may rather wonder at the appearance of the vegetable tribe before the mention of the sun,—before that influence of the solar light and heat, which is ordinarily necessary to their growth. The difficulty is met by what has been before conjectured, of the pre-existence of the matter of the sun, though not with the same degree of luminosity, nor possibly under the same general conditions as now. On the intention of the sacred writer to place them in the order here given, there can, however, be no doubt. It is confirmed by his own incidental allusion to the vegetable world in the

[1] Ps. civ. 2; Is. xl. 22; xlii. 5.

CHAP. VI.

following chapter, where, speaking of the absolute origination of all things from the immediate hand of God, and of "the day when the Lord made the earth and the heavens," he instances at once in the "plant of the field" as that which was first produced, and thus gives undesigned witness to the truth of his own former account, and the perfect consistency of the two increases our confidence in the writer's fidelity, and leaves no doubt that the vegetable products did really precede the solar arrangements of the fourth day, and of course, therefore, the animal tribes which followed. From this precedence of the vegetable to the animal creation, it has been argued that the "six days" cannot represent or answer to the great geological periods (as some have made them do), inasmuch as, in the corresponding disposition of fossils, there is not found anything answering to this precedence of vegetable products over the lower forms, at least, of animal life. On the contrary, these are found rather to precede the other, if we except only a few fucoid weeds of the earlier strata. Without exactly adopting the hypothesis in question, we must say that such a conclusion scarcely follows from the premises. There might surely, consistently with the Scripture account, have been somewhat of animal life in the bosom of the waters, previous to the great upgrowth of vegetation here named, though not particularly specified by the sacred historian; and though he appears to re-

serve all mention of animal life till the time when the higher species came into being, and the animals were more complete and perfect in their kind, as on the fifth day. Those primitive waters over which "the Spirit" is said to have "brooded," need not be supposed to have been entirely unproductive of some forms of life from the first.[1]

A more observable thing, perhaps, is the close coherence in the works of the successive days. The order of the first three has been *light*, *air*, *water*, *earth*: *i.e.* the *elements* of things (as they may be roughly termed), before the things themselves which were to be compounded of them. Next came the compound organisms themselves; and they, too, in a corresponding[2] order: the "sun" and "moon" of the fourth day answering to "light" on the first; "birds," to the "air," on the fifth and second; and lastly, "creeping things, and cattle," to "plants and earth," on the sixth and third. Yet the entire absence of any attempt to draw attention either to the order or the correspondence—such as would inevitably have

[1] See Appendix-note at the end of this chapter.

[2] This correspondence is ably stated by Dr. Kalisch—the analogy, (*i. e.*) between the first three and the last three days. He divides the six into two triads. Between some of the days, as between the third and fourth, there seems no natural connection, but taken crosswise, the analogy immediately appears, thus:—1. First Day: Light = Fourth Day: The celestial orbs, the sources of light. 2. Second Day: Water and heaven = Fifth Day: Fishes and birds. 3. Third Day: Dry land and vegetation = Sixth Day: Animals and man: *i.e.* the inhabitants of the land and the consumers of the vegetation.

CHAP. VI.

been found in a professedly scientific treatise—marks the character of the narrative, and stamps it with a simplicity which bespeaks its truth. We proceed to the special work of the next day:

Fourthly, *Chap.* I. *vv.* 14—19. *The fourth Day.*

v. 14. "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years:

v. 15. "And let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so.

v. 16. "And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: *He made* the stars also.

v. 17. "And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth,

v. 18. "And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that *it was* good.

v. 19. "And the evening and the morning were the fourth day."

There is a slight distinction in the Hebrew construction between verses 14 and 16, to which we have nothing answering in the English version. In verse 14 it is as in the English version, "Let there be lights," &c. In verse 16, there is the article prefixed in the Hebrew, and it is, "And God made *the* two great lights," &c., which looks as though Moses would be understood as adopting a term in

common use among the people of his time for the sun and moon, rather than so denominating them out of his own mind. This article may also influence the whole construction, and give additional reason for thinking (what otherwise is sufficiently probable) that the words in verse 16, should be rather rendered, "And God *appointed* the two great lights — the greater of them to rule the day, and the lesser of them to rule the night;" expressing, *i.e. the design* of these greater luminaries, and not their actual creation, which, for aught here said, might have taken place at quite another time. And if this be the meaning as to the sun and moon, much more may we so understand it in reference to "the stars," which otherwise seem here introduced in an almost unaccountable manner[1],

[1] "The words in the text are indeed, 'He made the stars also;' but the whole sentence comes in so very abruptly, that one would be apt to imagine that after Moses' time it was inserted by somebody who had a mind to be mending his hypothesis; or else was added by way of marginal note at first, and at length crept into the text itself, as F. Simon hath evidenced in several other instances. For the fixed stars do not seem to be comprehended in the six days' work, which relates only to this planetary world, which has the sun for its centre."—Stackhouse, *Hist. of the Bible*, b. i. c. 1. By some the words are taken with those immediately preceding, thus, "The lesser light, to rule the night and (to rule) the stars." So Benisch, *Translation of Pentateuch*, London, 1851. It is finely remarked by Buckland, "This very slight notice of the countless host of celestial bodies, all of which are probably suns, the centres of other planetary systems, whilst our little satellite, the moon, is mentioned as next in importance to the sun, shows clearly that astronomical phenomena are here spoken of only according to their relative importance to our earth and to mankind, and without any regard to their real importance in the boundless universe."—Buckland, *Bridgewater Treatise*, vol. i. p. 27.

CHAP. VI.

as if they were all made on this fourth day, when there is nothing in all the days but what relates chiefly to the earth! We may conceive, then, that while some new rule was imposed upon the "greater lights," there was imparted some corresponding influence to "the stars" also.

That the masses of the heavenly bodies, including even those here particularly mentioned of the sun and the moon, were formed and projected into their several spheres at some remote period far antecedent to the fourth day, we have already had occasion to propound as the most probable account of the matter. The original formation of these bodies, subject to whatever modifications might afterwards be necessary, and which might have made up the fourth day's work, would thus be referable, in common with all things beyond the immediate sphere of the globe which we inhabit, to that great primordial "beginning" of all created matter, which Moses lays down in the first verse of the chapter. The Rabbinical commentators, as we have before noticed, understood it to be the same "light," under different conditions, which is spoken of on the first, and here again on the fourth day. And why not? In the English, it is true, the word "lights"[1] in the latter passage carries somewhat of an ambiguous sense; but the plural use of it sufficiently shows, that "light" and

[1] More clearly in the *Latin*, "Luminaria;" *Greek*, φωστῆρες; *Heb.* מְאֹרֹת;—evidently differing from "Lux," φῶς, אוֹר.

"lights" were not intended as identical. In the Hebrew, as also in the Greek and Latin, the distinction is, however, quite clearly marked; in the former passage it is "light" in the abstract, while in the latter it is "lightbearers," or "luminaries," *i. e. implements for holding and diffusing the light.* It is not, however, in either case expressly stated, nor is it necessary to understand, that these implements of light were then first created. It is said only, "Let them be . . . to give light upon the earth," and that "God made them," or set them in their exact places, "the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night." And no small instance of skill and power it was to bring two such stars into those exact positions with respect to the earth, and to set up such a mutual interdependence of motion between them, that the grand effect of night and day, so beneficial to the interests of man, should thenceforward result, and should continue on with such singular and constant regularity. They were to be "for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years." Now, granting that all the stars serve in some degree for "signs," in marking out the different quarters of the heavens; that through their accumulated lustre they have an important share in enlightening the night; that they are "signs" to the mariner, and help to guide the calculations of science, how incalculably more serviceable to man are those two nearer, and to us brighter orbs, which are "for seasons" as well

CHAP. VI.

as "for signs!" See how, by their means, "seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night,"[1] cease not, but are secured to us in admirable and orderly succession! See how the night is cheered—the long nights at the poles especially, during the six months' absence of the sun—by the great reflecting mirror of the moon, which in that interval never sets to the inhabitants of those regions! How, with the different rates of speed, both internally on their own axis, and as carried round their respective centres, both sun and moon keep yet so near together in their periods, and the yearly circle is undisturbed, and keeps up a regular correspondence with the monthly! Must not the hand of God be seen in this? And what more worthy of special notice by the inspired historian than the "greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night?" And all the while, the greater luminary itself, the earth and all the planets, the moon and the other attendant satellites, are poised on nothing! They perform their evolutions, and maintain their relative places, in mid air, in the regions of comparatively vacant space, and unsupported by any visible agency! Thoughts of these things tend powerfully to humble and to elevate the mind: they oppress and confound, while they delight and interest the imagination of every beholder. The contemplation of them, therefore, forms a sublime

[1] Gen. viii. 22.

and appropriate introduction to the volume of inspiration, and must necessarily prepossess every devout mind with noble, though still inadequate, conceptions of the skill, the wisdom, and the goodness of the great and merciful Creator.

THE apparent discrepancy between the Mosaic account and the observations of Nature as to the precedency of plants to animals in the one, and the reverse in the other, seems to deserve more special notice here. Geology produces, among the earliest fossil remains, nearly as many specimens of animal (in its lower forms, at least, as *zoophytes*, *mollusca*, &c.) as it does of vegetable life. Again, it is observed, that many forms of *fishes*—many even of the most perfect—occur in strata far below those which contain the great sea-monsters and birds, and which are supposed to answer to the "fifth day." The question, therefore, arises, how far these facts are compatible with any theory of reconciling Geology with Revelation? Some cut the knot at once, and refer all to the Deluge. (See *Voices from the Rocks*, &c.) Others solve the phenomena by supposing an unrecorded, but highly probable, fecundity of the primeval "waters." (Gen i. 2.) An argument from analogy may, we think, be suggested in favour of the latter hypothesis. We find in the record of the animal creation (comp. vv. 20 and 24), that "the waters" are commanded to "bring forth" *before* "the earth;" and we shall presently see (Chap. VII. p. 205) that the first recorded "blessing" was upon "the waters" (v. 22). The supposition, then, of a similar productiveness of the same element, to bring forth the lower forms of animal life in the bosom of the ocean, before any recorded terrestrial vegetation, has at any rate some analogy in its favour. We may at least say that, as regards *marine vegetation* (and marine *animation* was evidently contemporaneous with it), it is likely enough, upon the strength of this analogy, to have preceded the *terrestrial vegetation* of vv. 11, 12,—even as the marine creatures preceded those of the land in vv. 20, 24.

CHAP. VII.

The Mosaic Order of Creation continued.

"Sanctius his animal, mentisque capacius altæ,
Finxit in effigiem moderantûm cuncta Deorum;
Pronaque cùm spectent animalia cætera terram,
Os homini sublime dedit: cœlumque tueri
Jussit, et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus."
Ovid. *Met.* i. 76—86.

"How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! in action, how like an angel! in apprehension, how like a God!" *Hamlet.*

CHAP. VII.

The work of furnishing the world for its new inhabitant goes steadily onward—it may be it was completed—on the fifth day. Reasons were assigned at the 9th verse, for embracing that and the 10th verse in the work of the second day, though it appears at first sight to have ended at ver. 8, "And the evening and the morning were the second day;" and though the words with which verse 9 begins ("And God said"), more usually occur at the beginning than towards the end of a day's work. There are reasons for thinking that a similar construction holds in the description of this fifth day, on which we are now entering. In both cases (vv. 9 and 24) we have only to understand the words just quoted in the pluperfect tense, which

in the Hebrew is the same as the perfect.[1] The reasons for thus including vv. 24, 25 in the fifth day, are, first, That, as the vegetable creation was all completed within the compass of a single day, it seems natural to expect that the same would happen with the animal; and next, That by this means we have an entire day reserved for the creation of man himself. And when we observe how many things were crowded into the work of the last day of all when man was created,—things relating exclusively to man,—there seems the less occcasion to encumber it with more, as we should have to do on the other supposition of the fifth day ending, as at first sight it appears to do, with ver. 23. For, besides the brief account in chapter i. we have to allow for the supplementary details of chapter ii., the placing in the garden of Eden—the giving of the command—of course, therefore, the inspection of all the trees of the garden—an acquaintance with the beasts, and the naming of them—as also "the deep sleep" which "fell on Adam"—and the formation of Eve (for this is the order in which these particulars[2] occur, chap. ii. 15–25). When indeed we reckon up all these par-

[1] See a similar construction, Gen. xii. 1: "God had said to Abraham." Heb., "God said." So again, Gen. ii. 8, 18: "God planted"—"said"—for "God *had* planted:" *i.e.* on the third day "*had* said."

[2] Yet this may be uncertain, if, as before, ch. i. 9, 24, we render ch. ii. 18, 21, "God *had* said," "*had* caused." See Patrick on ch. iii. 1, on the time which might have been occupied in these several transactions.

CHAP. VII.

ticulars, we have more reason to confess our ignorance, than to speak too positively on the exact measure of time. It may even seem to confirm an idea we have elsewhere advocated, of the longer duration of the earlier days of the world, compared with the twenty-four hours of our present time. foregoing observations may at least justify us in extending the work of the fifth day beyond the limit popularly assigned it, so as to embrace the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses. It will then run as follows:—

Fifthly, *Chap.* I. *vv.* 20—25. *The fifth Day.*

v. 20. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl *that* may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

v. 21. "And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that *it was* good.

v. 22. "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

v. 23. "And the evening and the morning were the fifth day.

v. 24. "And God (*had*) said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.

v. 25. "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that *it was* good."

The word "created" is here used for the first time since ver. 1, to express, says Patrick, "the vastness of these creatures of the deep; not because they were made, as the chaos was, out of nothing; but because it required a greater power to make out of the precedent matter moving things of so huge a bulk, and of such great agility, than to make any other thing hitherto formed." It does not occur again till the creation of man himself, ver. 27. The "blessing" pronounced, ver. 22, on the inhabitants of the *water* especially (the first blessing in Genesis), justifies the remark that it seems typical of the blessing on Christian baptism; and so the early fathers understood it. It is also observable that the "waters" are made the first instrument of production, verse 20, and then the "earth," verse 24. As to the distinction of the creatures here specified, they are in accordance with the usual classification among the Jews, and correspond very nearly with those in Psalm viii., "all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea."[1] But not intending to write a natural history, and hastening on to the advent of man upon the stage,

[1] Ps. viii. 7, 8.

CHAP. VII.

we merely remark further on the completeness of the furniture now prepared for his habitation and use. Above and around, the canopy of the sky, "the heavens spread forth as a curtain;"—beneath, the flowery carpet of the earth,—everywhere the fragrant blossom and the fruitful tree, the springing fountain and the mossy brook, the hill and dale, the thicket and the shade, the playful lamb, and the bounding deer, the cattle browsing the tender herb, and the nobler beast majestically pacing the forest;—such was the scene, and such the happy aspect of the place which the goodness of God had prepared for his accommodation.

In announcing the creation of man himself, a marked change takes place from the form of command, as we had it on the preceding days, "Let the earth bring forth," or "Let the waters bring forth," to that of mutual consultation as among the divine persons of the Godhead. For now we seem admitted to the council-chamber of Omnipotence, and we see before us a work which engages, so to speak, the united energy of the blessed Trinity. "Let us make man in our image." The more perfect creature, the masterpiece of creation, the *intellectual* animal, is to be "after the image of God" Himself. "Male and female creates He them," partakers alike of that same image which is now our most perfect ideal of the human nature, as it proceeded originally from the hands of the Creator. This is he to whose use all other creatures hitherto

made were intended to subserve. To him, as it were, all things converge and are tributary, as rivers to the ocean, or as the stars of heaven to the earth our habitation. In how few and emphatic strokes does the sacred penman dash off this noble and comprehensive picture! The introduction, too, is as sublime as the representation itself—that mysterious voice from the Triune Jehovah, "Let us make man!" Observe also the threefold, we may rather say, the fourfold repetition of the idea, which cannot fail to be noticed as we go through the passage.

Sixthly, *Chap.* I. *vv.* 26–28, 31. *The sixth Day.*

v. 26. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

v. 27. "So God created man in his *own* image: in the image of God created He him; male and female created he them.

v. 28. "And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.[1]

[1] With this compare the account, ch. ii. 7: "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his

CHAP. VII.

v. 31. "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, *it was* very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

The fourfold repetition here of the Divine "image" and "likeness," must surely deepen the impression, which most readers must have felt when this noble passage first caught their eye, and its deep meaning flashed upon their thoughts. The description may be wanting in that minuteness of detail, which would suit some philosophical or professedly scientific treatise. But we are not to fancy an Aristotle expounding in exact and logical method, the order and interdependence of the

nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." We here learn from what materials the outer frame of man was made —even the same to which it shall return (for "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," Gen. iii. 19); and also whence the *living* particle came—even from the "breath" of his Maker. This "breath," because it is plural in the Hebrew, some have thought to include various spiritual gifts, in addition to the animal life. But it seems chiefly the intention in ch. ii. to enlarge on the physical conditions of man's life, and not on the spiritual, as we see again in the formation of Eve from Adam's side, vv. 21–25. Kalisch compares Job xxvii. 3, "All the while *my breath* is in me, and the Spirit of God within my nostrils;" Job xxxiii. 4, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me *life;*" and thinks that, altogether, the "breath" and the "life" here spoken of go no higher than the animal life. But the quotation of the words following by an inspired authority, and which describe the effect of this "breath of life," seems to put the matter out of all doubt,—viz. that Moses is here occupied with merely the physical details, and not, as in ch. i., with the spiritual and physical combined. We find the passage quoted by St. Paul as an ascription of mere "natural" life to "the first Adam," which he contrasts with that gift of "spiritual" life proceeding from "the Second," "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." 1 Cor. xv. 45.

several parts of the human frame; nor a Socrates bidding us, in the beautiful structure of the body, "in the eyes to see and the ears to hear, in the nice guard of the eyelids, in the fencing those lids with eyelashes which, like a sieve, strain the dusty wind, and hinder it from hurting the delicate structure of the eye, to behold and recognise the work of an intelligent Being." In the case of Moses, it would not have suited with his main design to be too nice and orderly in such matters of detail. He hastens at once to his great purpose; and carried on by the torrent of his faith, he overleaps minor considerations, and shows himself burdened with the one great thought of the true destiny of man, of his superiority to all other bodies, and of his direct affinity to the great Being himself from whom all creation sprang. He refuses, as it were, to loiter on the threshold; and rushing forward into the arcana of the temple, he lifts the veil which discloses to us "Man" in the "image of his Maker."

We propose to devote the remainder of this chapter to a fuller development of this idea; in doing which, we need not detain ourselves long (though it deserves a place in the description) with that old Rabbinical exposition which makes the terms of the "likeness" to consist in this: that the "soul," or rational principle, "governs the body, as God governs the world." "The soul," said they again, "fills the body, as God fills the

CHAP. VII.

heaven:" "as there is but one God in heaven, so in the body the soul is one;—like God, the soul is undefiled by bodily pollution; like God, herself unseen, she sees all things; like God, she sleeps not; and as no man is like God, so among men none is like another." There is much elegance in these conceptions; but the whole seems open to this serious objection, that, whereas, in the regimen of the soul over the body in a man, these are both parts of the same composition; in the regimen of the Supreme Being over the world, it is not that of a soul informing it, but of a Governor wholly distinct, separate, and essentially differing from it. Such a view might, therefore, give a handle to that fundamental and dangerous error of the Pantheist, which would confound the Deity with the works of his hands, and resolve into a mere *anima mundi* (or material energy in nature itself) that great First Cause of all, who is infinitely above all, and is the fountain from which all proceeds according to the good pleasure of His will. With the light of Christianity to guide us, we may come nearer to a true comprehension of the words. In the express promises which the gospel contains of renewal after the Divine Image, and in the known character of that renewal, we have a safe clue to the true nature of the qualities and privileges intended. That which is offered to be restored must plainly be identical with that which was originally lost; and thus discovers to us what that property

was which we may ascribe to man in the original completeness of his nature. In the revelation of an incarnate Saviour, uniting in His one sacred Person the two perfect natures, we have actually placed before our eyes the complete realisation of the "Image" spoken of. And though the very sacredness of the Person precludes us from arguing immediately from the God-man to the rest of the sons of Adam; yet, under proper limitations, we have the authority of the Divine oracles themselves for instituting a comparison in *some* degree. What is true of the Son of God in the perfection of His nature, is proportionably true, in various derived degrees, of those whose representative He became. At all events, when we find ourselves exhorted to "put off the old man with his deeds, to be renewed in the spirit of our minds, and to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,"[1] the question comes before us in a most real and practical shape. The difficulty lies in our present loss of this image. If the subject concerned some merely inferior parts of man's constitution, unaffected (if any such there are) by the sad consequences of sin, the appeal might have been more easily made to actual observation of his daily habits and life, and a fair inference drawn thence as to his nature and constitution in those respects. But now the case is different. We are speaking of his whole moral,

[2] Eph. iv. 22—24.

CHAP. VII.

physical, and mental condition; and, in forming a right estimate of it, we have to contend with a peculiar difficulty arising from the confessed imperfection and corruption of the whole man.

We shall begin, therefore, from this point. For it may be regarded as the confession of the heathen, no less than of the Christian, philosopher, that every where there are symptoms of this moral degeneracy. Jarring and contending affections, enfeebled powers of good, and strong tendencies to evil; the better judgment often overborne by the strength of passion within, or the force of temptation without; the obliquity of the understanding, and the feebleness of the will; these phenomena have at all times presented no very flattering picture of himself to the heart and conscience of man. The strange inconsistency of his nature has often dismayed and perplexed him. He has marked, with shame and disquietude, how the beast with his instinct seems, in his proportion, to behave better than man with his reasonable understanding; and how the less perfect creatures in their kind seem to have surpassed himself, the most perfect of any, in following and observing the law of their being. Yet if, through this confessed degenerate condition of man, when unassisted by the special grace of God, we may yet see something left of a better mind, something heavenward in its tendency, though often overborne to evil, we may surely take the benefit of the discovery, to recognise, amidst all

the deformities of his nature, an original likeness of man to his Maker. Who does not see, that there still remain some lineaments of the Divine similitude? It is not without significance on this head that, in a striking and prominent passage of Holy Scripture, man is declared to have the Divine image still, at so late a period as when laws were given anew to Noah, long after the ravages of the fall, and its deadly consequences in the flood.[1] But, to come to particulars: What but the remains of good is that noble faculty, hence called the "Vicegerent of God" in every man's bosom, the Conscience? What else are those higher affections, whereby we love? whereby we apprehend and seek the good of others, as if it were our own? What else are the social instincts, which go so far to humanise even the savage breast?—the sense of truth and falsehood, of right and wrong, of integrity and fraud? What all the other instances of a moral sense? What else is it that draws us to a contemplation of the Divine nature? Does not all this argue something of Divinity in man? a secret sympathy and bond of union, which, though it be somewhat weakened and obscured, is yet really there, and which indeed is witnessed to by the very name *religion?* For what is religion, but a *binding back*, *i. e.* the renewal of a link originally subsisting, when man came forth in the Divine image? And it is in proportion as this image is regained that man finds a greater and

[1] Gen. ix. 6.

CHAP. VII.

growing delight in the study of the Creator and the Creator's works. The idea of His affinity deepens and improves, as he continues to work it out. Such result is dependent, no doubt, on the gift of inspiration of the same Spirit, by which the image was originally wrought. But who can say that the Spirit is ever wanting? Who cannot see with what abundance of efflux it goes forth to meet those who sincerely seek it,—who find themselves dissatisfied without it? who seem to have failed hitherto because they forgot or overlooked their dependence upon Him? or because, under an imperfect appreciation of the gift of God, they had thought of Him as of One afar off, instead of as One brought nigh by the intercession of the One Mediator? Who can say, further, but that such revival of the Divine image is within the power of the Gospel—nay, is its very object? The true ideal may have been realised only by that One among the sons of Adam, who took our nature upon Him without abating the perfections of His own Divinity; but it is realised also among his followers, in proportion as they are under the operation and influence of the same Spirit, and endeavour faithfully to follow His steps. It is that to which the hearty endeavours of regenerate man are all tending; it is daily witnessed and felt in thousands who, in the humble walks of life, it may be, but in sincerity and truth are "taking up their cross and following Christ," and are seeking to "glorify God

in their bodies and their spirits, which are His." We will now seek to gather into one view the several particulars of man's nature, which seem to be comprised in the sacred portraiture before us.

1. First, in order, we are perhaps justified in mentioning the dignity and majesty of his person, together with all those endowments of his *body* which distinguish him above all other inhabitants of the earth. The juxtaposition of the clauses in ver. 26 may be pleaded as a sufficient authority for including these bodily advantages in our view. It seems equally in the intention of the writer to express this truth, when he says, Gen. ix. 2–6, "And the fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea: into your hand are they delivered. . . . Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for *in the image of God made He man.*" And again, Ps. viii. 6, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet." But not the dignity alone, or commanding attitude, or such other features of the outward form in man are to be regarded: to these sterner excellences, so to speak, of the man we must add the gentler but not less noble qualities of her who was given to be his companion. To this we are led by the evident parity of rank and eminence attributed to the woman, where, after declaring the formation of both

CHAP. VII.

in the Divine image, it is immediately subjoined, "Male and female created he them." Not merely in a social sense was it "not good that man should be alone," but also "it was not good" in regard to the reflection of the Divine attributes.

To some it may appear trifling to mention these bodily qualifications. They are not trifling, when we regard them aright, as admirable manifestations of the Spirit within. We may think, rather, how much of the attitude and air of command in Adam was due, not to his bodily part alone, but proceeded also, and in a higher degree, from that loftiness of his understanding and power of his will, which beamed in every look, and displayed itself in every limb. Another gift common to both, and worthy of special mention, was that eminent gift of speech, by which man is distinguished from the brute; by which he converses, and compares ideas; by which he thus becomes susceptible of social improvement, and is naturally a progressive being; by which, above all, he praises God, and glorifies Him by the open confession of His truth, by prayer, and by the fruit of his lips in magnifying and praising His holy Name. But with all these advantages, the mere bodily part could in no sense adequately have represented the image of Deity, unless it were combined with that which we shall mention in the second place, viz.

2. A corresponding excellence in the pervading and presiding *soul*. And, therefore, in his mind,

or intellectual and moral part, in that which concerns his inward apprehension of the things presented to his senses, in his reasoning powers, in the power of the will, subjecting to itself all the human appetites and passions, the chief resemblance to his Maker was to lie. And that this principle of reason, after its first implantation by the fiat of the Almighty, became afterwards congenital with the bodily element, not merely an addition or appendage to it, but interwoven with it in one nature, and essential to its very being, seems the general conclusion of physiologists. The very germ of life in man seems necessarily fraught with some higher faculty than is enjoyed by the lower orders of creation. To think is with him as necessary as to live; and the power so to do, when not hindered by accidental disorders of his constitution, is bound up necessarily with his very existence.

3. To the above sentient and intelligent parts of man was to be added, *thirdly*, that great gift of the Spirit, which should rule over the whole composition of his nature, and be itself subordinate only to the Divine will. How far this latter gift was made over to him, as it were, in possession, was compounded into his nature, and made an integral part of himself; or how far it was by way of adventitious aid from without, and dependent on the use made of it, revelation does not inform us, nor are we able precisely to ascertain. The degrees in which it is inherent in the nature of man, or, more

CHAP. VII.

properly, a supernatural addition, has therefore been matter of considerable dispute, and we make no attempt to decide it here. Putting, however, all the above endowments together, viz. *body*, *soul*, and *spirit*, and attributing to all that perfection of kind in which they originally came forth from the hands of the Creator, we find something like an adequate representation of the Scripture ideal of human nature, without being driven to the absurdity—not to say the impiety—of imagining in man the absolute perfections and attributes of Deity. We have found sufficient in these threefold gifts and the various endowments which they comprise, to establish the truth of the picture drawn by Moses, when he declares him to have been "created in the image of God." No picture of him, it appears, could have been more just, or could more have displayed the Master's hand. We find it realised in the harmonious combination of faculties of the highest order, of body, soul, and spirit. When the spiritual part was in entire harmony with the Divine Spirit; when his whole mind and affections, his understanding and will, were in conformity with the mind and will of God; when the contexture and temperament of the bodily frame was such, that it freely obeyed and co-operated with the higher motions of the soul; a condition must have existed approaching as nearly to a likeness of his whole nature to the Divine as the earthly can approach to the spiritual, or the finite be made like to the

Infinite. And here we see the reason, why it is that mere logical acumen, or even the highest powers of intellect, do not always, nor necessarily, confer superiority of character. "The race," in this sense, "is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong" (Eccles. ix. 11), but "God giveth to him that is good in His sight wisdom, knowledge, and joy" (Eccles. ii. 26). Even a good quality may lose its virtue by being cultivated exclusively and in undue excess; and it is the same with the powers of the intellect. Under due subordination, and the corrections of an humble and faithful spirit, they may be regarded as the highest endowment in the noblest work of God with which we are acquainted. But it is rather the nice balance of all the faculties and affections, than the preponderance of any one, that gives the best and most satisfactory results.

It was a doctrine much favoured by the early Fathers of the Church[1], that the "likeness" after which man was created was that of the Son of God, referring this, not to the incarnate form of the Son, but to those spiritual attributes which were His from all eternity, as the Word and Wisdom of the Father. Thus St. Augustine[2], "The similitude of God, after which man was made, may be understood to be the Word of God itself, that is, the

[1] Besides the authorities in the text, St. Jerome says, "The image and similitude of God is not the form of the body, but of the mind, which is fashioned to a resemblance to the true image of Christ, who is the image of the invisible God."—Jerome, *in Ezek.* i.

[2] De Genesi, c. 16.

CHAP. VII.

Only-begotten Son." Again, "The Divine beauty of the Son is impressed upon our souls through participation of the Holy Ghost."[3] Whether this opinion have sufficient authority in Holy Scripture, whether it is based on any intelligible distinction in the Divine attributes, and how far we can venture to attribute to man, in his first estate, powers superior to the angels because equal in quality to the Son of God, is not for us to pronounce. It is, perhaps, enough to believe that there was a real communication of Deity to man through the Spirit, and that man "partook of the Divine nature," even as he is once more invited to do (2 Pet. i. 4). From all we know of the Divine purposes, it was the intention of the Creator to communicate to His creatures, and especially to man, some portion of His own happiness. He was destined, it would seem, to an immortality of happy service, wherein he might advance from stage to stage in knowledge of the Divine will, and in the blessed enjoyment of the Divine favour. To apprehend God as the chief good, and to enjoy Him in all the manifestations of

[3] Clem. Alex. *c. Julian,* lib. i. p. 25. The Fathers themselves dwelt less on the derivation of the image from the Son especially, than upon the intrinsic nature of the gifts conferred. Thus S. Basil: "The soul of man, from having been created in the image of God, thought that which was good, and knew the enjoyment of it." Greg. Nyssen: "There is in us, because of God's image, the form of all good, all virtue, all wisdom." *De Hom. Opif.* c. xvi. The reader is referred to an able statement of the general view of the Fathers on this head in Scudamore's *Essay on the Office of the Intellect,* chaps. vi. vii. viii.

His love, this was designed to fill the capacities of his heart, and to exercise him in returns of gratitude, adoring love, and obedience. As he bore a filial relation to the Creator, and was destined to an eternal inheritance of glory, he would not be left destitute of capacities to fit him for this distinguished position, as a child of God, and inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven. Whatsoever might be wanting to fill up the measure of such capacities we may safely affirm would be granted to him, and would be found among the gifts wherewith his nature was endowed. Thus furnished, and having all his faculties in perfect adaptation to the purposes of his being, there would be no natural impediment in man to a perfect conformity to the will of God, a perfect obedience to His law, and to a filial love and reverence of His Name. And nothing short of this would seem to answer to the description of the inspired penman, "In the image of God made He man."

If there was what we might venture to call an imperfection (as in everything finite must be expected somewhere), was it in this, that there was no compulsion on his will? and, therefore, no necessary immutability in the fruition of all the excellences of his first estate? Perplexing thoughts may thus arise, and doubts be insinuated as to the original perfection of his nature, if such were the conditions of it. Nor are these done away when we open the next revealed page in his history;

CHAP. VII.

when we find him succumbing to the strength and subtlety of the tempter, and deflecting from the original law of his being. But whether it may not be the law of all finite created being, that *habits* of virtue should be necessary to the complete formation and stability of virtuous character, and how far this principle may extend to the most absolute heights of holiness and piety, it is easier to speculate than positively to affirm. Time may be required for development in all the higher departments of created existence, and a fair field of exercise, that the habits may be formed which are necessary for such stability and perfection. And what if this time was not in the present instance allowed? what if, by inscrutable permission, it was prematurely curtailed? and if, therefore, the discipline was rendered ineffectual and unavailing to the end proposed? What if a greater perfection is yet in store, it may be, even in consequence of the fall? What if, affording scope, as it did, for the intervention and exercise of redeeming love and mercy, the very failure became a source of greater and more abiding strength? And if it be so, we may at least see some reason to be less dismayed at the first apparent failure of the Divine purpose with man; and while we stand in awe of sin, we may indulge the hope that out of evil will come forth, by ways mysterious to us, a greater good. And when, as believers in revelation, we proceed to unfold its still later pages, we there find the direct and infallible assurance

that the resources of Divine grace and wisdom were not exhausted by that first catastrophe. Means were at hand, and a purpose in store, to rectify the disordered condition, and to restore the lost image in man. The Apostle who dwells longest on the depth of the degradation, and exclaims, "Oh! wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"—strikes at the same time the keynote of deliverance, in that burst of praise which follows, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Here we have provision, not merely for pardon and reconciliation, but for the healing and recovery of the wounds of sin. A method is disclosed to us, which, without disparagement of the justice of God, gives full scope to his mercy, and enables Him to be at the same time "just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." (Rom. iii. 26.) The gates of acceptance are again thrown open, and man returns as a necessary consequence into free communion with the father of spirits; and becoming again, through membership with Christ, the child of God, and the inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, recovers through the operation of Divine grace, and the indwelling power of the Spirit, that participation in the Divine image which once seemed hopelessly lost.

What more elevating subject, then, of contemplation can be imagined than this of man's relation to the Most High? What more admirable than the

CHAP. VII.

wisdom, the power, and the goodness by which we are made capable of immortality? What more excellent than that gift of understanding whereby we may conceive of, though we cannot measure, the Infinite Himself? What more noble than that elastic essence of the will, at whose command the inferior appetites and passions, all the powers of body and of mind, spring into action; and which is destined yet, in some higher sphere, to exemplify before assembled worlds the happiness of conforming itself perfectly and undeviatingly to the will of God? Endowed with these glorious faculties, imagine with what lofty feelings of pure delight must Adam have walked abroad, through the fair scenes with which he was surrounded! must have gazed upon the heavens above, and upon the earth beneath, in admiration of the Creator's skill! With what delight would he have experienced the power given him to utter with his lips the thoughts and emotions which filled his heart! To mark the adaptation of all things to his use—the grass growing for the cattle and herb for the service of man—the song of birds—the expanse of heaven lit up with the sun and moon, and with the glorious constellations of the sky—the repose of night and the thrilling call of morning to the works of the day; to feel himself the appointed Lord and Governor of the inferior creatures, all of whom were ministering to his use and happiness; above all, to feel himself conscious of higher thoughts, capable of seeing the

hand of God in all things—of holding converse with the Father of Spirits—of living to his glory, and in the hope and expectation of a still nearer approach to his immediate presence hereafter. Could anything be a more perfect picture of bliss? Must it not have been the very happiness of man in Paradise, to have enjoyed this consciousness of his destiny, and to have lived in the exercise of these high privileges and powers?

On the other hand there is, doubtless, something melancholy in the reflection, that so much happiness should have been lost and forfeited! Sadder still, when a man's conscience accuses him, that he himself has been accessory to the loss;—that he has not been awake to the high original of his nature, nor stirred to make any effort to recover it; but may have lived contented with some lower standard, some more earthly estimate of himself and of the purposes of his being! — that he has failed to look through and beyond the evident degeneracy of his nature to the true and original standard of excellence, and to aspire upwards to the attainment of the happiness which he has lost. Yet this happiness might still be his. His might again be the occupations and the delights of Adam in Paradise. They are stored up — and even in higher degrees, and with more perfect security against all mutation and decay—in the better state to which the Christian is called. They are made the prizes of the race of life to every one

CHAP. VII.

who, with humble heart and earnest mind and manly courage, will press forward to the reattainment of the once forfeited inheritance. And more than this, they are secured to him by express covenant and promise. It is not in consideration of the exact merit of the candidate, but on the most gracious terms of faith and repentance that they are offered. They are put freely within the reach of all who with sincere repentance and true faith and hearty endeavours, seek earnestly for them. Christ who merited them for us, will bestow grace sufficient to obtain them upon all who humbly seek it. They are not, therefore, unattainable and impossible objects of desire, mocking our hopes with the mere semblance of a blessing, or harrowing our minds with unavailing regrets for benefits long since withdrawn from our hands. And when we feel that we were made for them, as well as they freely offered to us, the ambition must surely be awakened within us to become partakers of them. And can it seem difficult to realise the object of this ambition, when even here we have the assurance that no inconsiderable progress might be made towards the perfection and renewal of the fallen nature? The misfortune is men are too apt to look downwards to the chains which bind them to earth, when they should rather lift up their eyes to the blessed links of that love which draws them back again to heaven. The Scriptures represent it with indubitable clearness, not merely as a desi-

rable contingency, but as a positive duty with Christians, that they should exhibit in the present life no mean degrees of that thorough transformation of the character which befits the image, and is the work of the Spirit of God, and which will be perfected in the life to come. To this effect is the exhortation of St. Paul, already adduced in elucidation of the meaning of the terms "after God's image" (Eph. vi. 21-24), "Be renewed in the Spirit of your minds, and put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." St. Peter, describing the "great and precious promises" of the Gospel, adds, "That by these ye might be partakers of the Divine nature." (2 Pet. i. 4.) "By the Spirit," says St. Paul in another place, "we are changed into the same image from glory to glory." "Of His fullness all we" — immediately, perhaps, meaning Christ's Apostles and Prophets, but indirectly also all other Christians—"have received, and grace for grace." (John i. 16.) Let then the love of God find admission into the heart, and already His image, will be found to have begun there. Let the love be accompanied with increasing degrees of holiness, and a steady growth in grace, and the Divine image grows with it. And though in its utmost perfection it may not be fully realised upon earth, the present beginnings will be the first fruits of a never-ending harvest — the earnests and fortastes of that final manifesta-

CHAP. VII.

ation of the sons of God, which will form the blessedness of heaven through the endless ages of eternity.

Alleged human remains in older strata. — Among the uncertain data of geological science, up to its present stage of advancement, must be reckoned the amount of evidence that exists, that human remains are to be found among the deposits of the drift period. Should it prove incontestably to be the case, it would *not necessarily* follow that a greater antiquity should be assigned to the human species than was before imagined, nor would it afford any direct evidence for the existence of Pre-adamite man. Among the hypotheses which would have to be examined in explanation of the phenomenon, would be some very violent action of floods or earthquakes (perhaps that of the great deluge itself), whereby deep receptacles were hollowed out, and the remains of man entombed among the older strata of the earth. We refer to some remarks in another place, on the necessity of our having many more elements in the data required for the theory of Pre-adamite man, than the mere discovery of bones. (See Chap. V. pp. 161, 162.) Even a few rough implements, picked up among the bones, would not suffice; for these too are of common occurrence in the ancient *Cromlechs* of Druidical times; yet no one assigns them a period of very extreme antiquity. We should require, not a few knives and arrow-heads of flint or iron, but the débris of large habitations, not to say of costly tombs and monuments. At any rate, the caution required would be extreme, and must be exercised over much larger areas than have been at present explored, in order to separate between original locality and the transporting effect of the elements, or even the hand of man himself excavating, in later times, a place of sepulture for the remains of the departed.

We may further remark, that by some Christian writers it is even maintained, that the existence of Pre-adamite races of men would not be found incompatible with the Scripture account; nor would involve consequences of which we should need to be afraid, as prejudicial to the faith of Christians. (See *Genesis of*

the Earth and Man.) On all such points, it would be wiser for the advocates of Scripture revelation, to withhold from binding themselves to particular dogmas on one side or the other; but rather to hold themselves free to follow in a more philosophical spirit the researches of science and the path by which it leads them.

Among the best-known instances of supposed human remains in the older deposits, are the specimens in the British Museum and in Paris of the human skeleton in hard limestone from the island of Guadaloupe; marks of feet from Santa in Peru; bones of men said to be mixed up in large quantities with bones of the hyæna, tiger, bear, antelope, &c., in certain caves in Franconia, in the south of France, in the departments of Aude and Gard, and here and there in Great Britain; and more recently still, a bone found by Dr. Dickeson of Natchez, United States, in "undisturbed blue clay."

As to the latter, inquiry remains to be made. The *cave*-remains do not appear difficult to account for. Without supposing an earlier race of men, we have only to suppose these bones washed down at some later period, from distances where they would be mingled on their way with other alluvial matter from various strata of the earth older, in many cases, than themselves. It is certain, *first*, that the bones of men, where they occur at all in these deposits, occur in extremely small proportions to those of bears and other quadrupeds; and *secondly*, that there is no manner of reason for dating them all alike from the same period. And precisely the same may be said of the few implements that have turned up, such as spears and arrow-heads, knives of flint, and in some cases rough specimens of pottery. We shall cite presently the evidence of Dr. Mantell on some of the most remarkable of these cave-remains. But where we come to hard limestone, and not mere alluvial soils, containing human remains, the difficulty is evidently greater. The first difficulty is to obtain a correct account of all the conditions of the phenomenon. Thus, to take the best known instance, the skeleton of a human figure from Guadaloupe. One writer (Dr. Young) reports thus, "The stone, which I carefully examined, greatly resembles some varieties of oolite limestone, like which it contains fragments of shells and of corals; the latter, as in the oolite, sometimes re-

CHAP. VII.

taining their original red colour. The bones are entirely fossilised, and have no appearance of recent bones." But what says Mr. Richardson (a great authority in Geology)? "The limestone at Guadaloupe . . . . is a recent deposit, formed by the following process: — The coral reefs which surround the island are abraded by the incessant action of the waves. The detritus thus produced is drifted to the shore in the state of coralline sand or mud, where, by the action of the atmosphere, or streams holding carbonate of lime in solution, the mass becomes indurated, and forms a compact limestone. It is evident that the rock was in a plastic state when these skeletons were placed in it, and *it is also ascertained that the bones are not fossilised*, but retain their animal matter and phosphate of lime. There is not sufficient evidence as to the mode in which they have been embedded, whether they are the relics of a battle, or were deposited as a mode of sepulture. . . . . A skeleton now in the Museum of Natural History at Paris was discovered in a sitting position, which is known to be the usual interment posture adopted by the aborigines of these regions."—Richardson, *Introduction to Geology*, ch. ix. 1851. The necessity of careful examination as to every minute particular, may further appear from the following anecdote by the same author, where he produces a picture very much in appearance resembling the skeleton of which we are speaking, and relates the following: "The celebrated naturalist Scheuchzer, who, with very considerable talents and attainments, possessed an equal share of credulity, wrote a treatise on a fossil skeleton, under the title of *Homo Diluvii Testis et Theoscopus*, the object of which was to prove the remains in question to be those of an individual who had been destroyed by the Deluge, but which Cuvier decided to belong to a salamander of extinct species and enormous size. A similar specimen is placed in the British Museum (Mineral Gallery, room iii. case 1)." *Introduction to Geology*, p. 26. And again, it has been remarked, "the femur of the bear is so like the human thigh bone, as to be readily mistaken without due caution; see Professor Owen, *British Mammalia*, p. 96."—Mantell, *Wonders of Geology*, p. 185, note. Then again, as to the *footprints at Santa*; — in the last edition of Dr. Mantell's book (often quoted in affirmation of the antiquity of these remains), we find

the following note; "In former editions of this work a notice was given of some supposed imprints of human feet on limestone, figured and described in an early volume of the *American Journal of Science.* These markings have since been carefully examined by Dr. Dale Owen, of New Harmony, and prove to have been sculptured by the aborigines!"

The *cave*-phenomena, as they may be called the most common and accessible sort, so, perhaps, they admit of the easiest solution. We shall take a more particular description of one or two of them, as we find it in Dr. Mantell. Describing *Kent's Cave*, near Torquay, he says, "The lower part of the cave is filled up to a thickness of twenty feet with reddish sandy loam full of fossil bones. This is covered by a layer of stalagmite, from one to four feet thick, which forms the floor of the cave. Upon this is a slight covering of earthy matter, with here and there patches of charcoal; a few human bones and fragments of coarse ancient pottery have been observed. Upon breaking through the sparry floor, the ossiferous earth is exposed, and, *embedded with the fossil-bones*, several flint knives with arrow and spear-heads of flint have been discovered. These stone implements are of the same kind as those found in the tumuli of the early British tribes, and unquestionably belong to the same period." He proceeds to account for these phenomena, and denies that either the implements, or the human bones thus discovered in the higher layer of these cavern-deposits, were necessarily contemporary with the carnivora whose existence, in and about the cave, are here indicated by their fossil-remains. "More accurate observations," he says, "have rendered it probable that the human remains were introduced at a later period. . . . . The bones of people who perished and were buried, or else who sought refuge in these caverns, would become blended with the mud, gravel, and débris of the animals already entombed; and a stalagmite paste might in some places be formed by the infiltration of water, as at *Bize* (Department Aude), and cement the whole into a solid aggregate. In concretionary masses of stone of this kind, containing bones of the bear and other extinct species, human bones, fragments of pottery, *terrestrial shells*, and bones of animals of modern times may therefore be associated." *Wonders of Geology*, pp. 183, 185.

CHAP. VII.

This occurrence of *land-shells*, and the general absence of marine fossils, while it is a mark of less antiquity than we often find assigned to the remains just mentioned, is also a distinguishing feature of the remarkable formation occurring in many parts of the coast of the Mediterranean, as in the *Rock of Gibraltar*. Here we have bones without end, mostly of extinct species—with abundance of land-shells—"leading to the conclusion, that a great part of the Mediterranean was once connected land, subject, like Calabria, to repeated visitations of earthquake; that the animals which inhabited the country fell into the fissures thus produced, and were preserved by the calcareous infiltrations that were constantly in progress. Subsequent convulsions, and denuding agencies, severed the country into rocks and insular masses, of which catastrophes the osseous conglomerates are the physical and only records."—*Mantell*, p. 188.

It has been seen, then, that in deciding on the exact nature of any alleged specimen, very careful discrimination is necessary, whether in concluding it to belong properly to the human species at all, or in referring it to any particular age of the world's existence. And if, in the treatment of each particular specimen, so much caution is required, much more ought we to be cautious in drawing conclusions from the whole class of phenomena unfavourable to the plain account of Scripture. We cannot too often repeat the observations of a great master of science:—"It is in the highest degree unwise in the friends of religion, whether individuals or communities, unnecessarily to embark their credit in expositions of Scripture on matters which appertain to natural science. By delivering physical doctrines as the teaching of revelation, religion may lose much, but cannot gain anything. This maxim of practical wisdom has often been urged by Christian writers. Thus St. Augustin says (*De Genesi*, lib i. c. xviii.) 'In obscure matters and things far removed from our senses, if we read anything, even in the Divine Scripture, which may produce diverse opinions without damaging the faith which we cherish, let us not rush headlong by positive assertion to either the one opinion or the other; lest, when a more thorough discussion has shown the opinion which we had adopted to be false, our faith may fall with it; and we should be found contending, not for the doctrine of the sacred Scriptures, but for our own; en-

deavouring to make our doctrine to be that of the Scriptures, instead of taking the doctrine of the Scriptures to be ours."—Whewell, *Indications of a Creator*, p. 184.

On the Image of God in man, various opinions.—"Habent illas ubique lineas Dei, qua immortalis anima, qua libera et sui arbitrii, qua præscia plerumque, qua rationalis, capax intellectûs et scientiæ."—Tertullian *c. Marcion*, l. ii. c. 9.

"Man being made in the similitude of God, has a reasonable mind, by which he may discern wisdom; therefore that Life, by which all things were made, that Life itself, is the Light,—not of all animals, whatever, but the 'Light of men.'"—S. Augustin, *Tract.* i. *in Joh. Ev.* c. 18.

"The Creator of the universe by His own word, our Saviour Jesus Christ, made the race of man after His own image, and gave him power through his resemblance to Him, to contemplate and become acquainted with the things that are, imparting to him a conception of His own eternity."—S. Athanasius, *c. Gent.*, vol. i.

"We have been fashioned after the true and most exact likeness of the Father—that is, the Son: and His divine beauty is impressed on our souls through participation of the Holy Ghost.—S. Cyr. Alex, *c. Julian.* lib. i.

"There are three constituents of the Divine image. 1. Lordship over Creation. 2. Knowledge (by reason) and language. 3. Communion with God."—Wilberforce, *Doct. of Incarnation*, c. iii. p. 65. Barry, *Introduction to Old Testament*, p. 75.

"The doctrine of one, personal, holy God, was not the only truth on which the law insisted. It unfolded, also, the *true doctrine of man;* his *dignity* and *wretchedness.* It urged not one of these great verities, but both: for only where the origin and grandeur of the human species are fully apprehended, can we hope to understand the turpitude of moral evil, and the real nature of the fall of man. The Bible tells us, that there is in him a high and God-like element, that instead of having been fashioned in the lower model of the brute creation, he came forth into the world erect in stature, and impressed with the Divine similitude; that in virtue of this kinship, human life is sacred

CHAP. VII.

(Gen. ix. 6), and that human spirits, on the dissolution of the body, return to God who gave them (Eccles. xii. 7). The leading property in which the high original of man has ever been distinctly traceable, is the freedom of his will, his power of self-determination. Here lay his greatest dignity, and here his greatest peril."—Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, p. 94, 95.

"Nowhere has the Godlikeness of man been conceived with such purity and sublimity as in the Scriptures; the affinity between God and man is a purely spiritual one—that of the internal faculties, of reason, of imagination, of love. The expressions "in our image, after our likeness," pre-suppose no visible form of the Deity; they are no remnants of heathen notions among the Hebrews; they do not deserve the hostile attacks of many modern critics. It is nothing less than a destruction of the very foundation of Biblical theology, to attribute to God any quality of corporeity. God governs the world by his infinite reason; is it astonishing that those who were, in some degree, destined to be the rulers of the earth, should resemble Him in that power by which alone they can uphold their superiority? We are not seriously concerned, if some natural philosophers make him the lineal descendant of the monkey, or the Batrachian."—Kalisch, *Commentary on Genesis*, i. 26.

"The features in which the first man resembled his Divine original, were chiefly the following:—(1.) The moral sense of discernment—an inward type of goodness impressed on human nature by the hand of God. (2.) Capacity of spiritual knowledge, and of intercourse with God. (3.) Spiritual illumination by actual indwelling of the Spirit."—Scudamore, *Office of the Intellect*, ch. vii.

"When I consider the admirable frame of my body, made up in that elegant, stately, and useful composure; and when I consider the usefulness, amplitude, and nobleness of my faculties, an understanding capable of the knowledge of all things necessary for me to know, accommodated and fitted to the perception and intellection (though not to the full comprehension) of a world full of variety and excellency, of a God full of all conceivable perfection and goodness; a memory able to retain the notions of what I understand; a will endued with freedom, whereby I am a subordinate lord of all my actions, and endued with a connatural pro-

pension and appetite unto rational good; reason and conscience to guide and direct me in all the inquiries and actions of my life; and, beside this, a soul, the stock and root of all those faculties, endued with immortality, and capable of everlasting blessedness: when I consider that this soul of mine is not only endued with faculties admirably fitted to the life of sense which I enjoy in this world, but find in it certain secret connatural rudiments of goodness and virtue, and a connatural desire and endeavour after a state of immortal happiness: and when I consider that this frame, both of body and soul, had its primitive origination immediately from the great Creator of all things, and although my own immediate origination was from my parents, yet that very productive virtue was implanted in the primitive nature by Almighty God, and the derivation of the same specifical nature to me was by virtue of His original institution and benediction; and by virtue thereof, that excellency and perfection of the human nature in its essential, which was first formed by the glorious God, is handed over to me, abating only those decays which sin brought into my nature: I say, when I deeply and intimately consider these things, I cannot but be sensible that that Being, from whom I thus derive this being, is a most wise, powerful, and bountiful Being, who could thus frame the human nature, and thus freely bestow and confer this constitution upon me. 2. And upon this sense of His wisdom, power, and goodness, I must needs entertain it with all imaginable admiration of it, and with all possible gratitude for so great and so free a gift. 3. And consequently I cannot choose but exercise the choicest affections I have towards Him, of reverence and fear of His greatness and majesty, of dependence and rest upon His power and goodness, of love to the excellency of His essential perfection and communicative goodness and beneficence. 4. And consequently of entire subjection unto Him, that upon all the rights imaginable hath the most just sovereignty over me. 5. And consequently of all due inquisitiveness, what is the will and pleasure of that God that I owe so much gratitude, love, and subjection to, that I may serve and please Him. 6. A resolved, entire, and hearty obedience to that will of His in all things, thereby to testify to Him my love, gratitude, and subjection. 7. An external manifestation to men and angels of that internal love and gratitude I owe Him, by

CHAP. VII.

continual praise and thanksgiving to Him, invocation of Him, reverence of Him, and all those acts of religion, duty, and obedience, which are the natural proceed of that internal frame of my soul towards Him. 8. A constant desire of my soul to enjoy as much of this bountiful, glorious, blessed Being as it is possible for my nature to be capable of. 9. And because my estate and condition in this life is but a state of mortality, and a temporal life, an earnest endeavour to have my everlasting soul fitted and qualified to be an everlasting partaker of His presence and goodness, in a state of nearer union to Him and fruition of Him, in that future life of glory and immortality. 10. And consequently abundance of circumspection, care, and vigilance, that I so behave myself in this state of probation here, that I neither lose His favour from whom I expect this happiness, nor render myself unworthy, unfit, or uncapable to enjoy it. . . .

"Almighty God, in the goodly frame of this world, hath manifested the exceeding greatness of His wisdom and power, as in the heavenly bodies, the sun, the moon, the stars, the elements, the meteors, the minerals, the vegetables, the animals; they all make up a most magnificent and stately Temple, and every integral thereof full of wonder, bears the inscription of the infinite wisdom, goodness, and power of the glorious God; yet still all these are but passive, receptive, and objective reflections of the goodness and glory of God; there is not a grass in the field, nor a tree in the forest, nor the smallest insect animal, the fly, the worm, but bear an inscription of the incomparable wisdom of the glorious God; but yet these cannot actively glorify their Maker, they understand not their own original, nor their own excellence; the noblest cedar in the field, nor the vastest elephant in the Indies, nor the goodliest whale in the ocean, have not the sense of their own excellence, nor from whom they had it, nor can actively and intentionally return praise and glory to their Maker, for they want an intellective principle to make those discoveries or returns.

"The glorious God, therefore, seems to have placed man in this goodly Temple of the world, endued him with knowledge, understanding, and will, laid before him these glorious works of His power and wisdom, that he might be the common Procurator, the vicarious Representative, the common High Priest of the inani-

mate and irrational world, to gather up, as it were, the admirable works of the glorious God, and in their behalf to present the praises, suffrages, and acclamations of the whole creation unto the glorious God, and to perform that for them, as their common Procurator, which they cannot actively, intellectively, and intentionally perform for themselves. It is true that the whole creation doth objectively, and according to their several capacities, set forth the honour and glory of their Creator, and cry '*Blessing, honour, glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever*,' Rev. v. 13: and the Psalmist, Ps. cxlviii., calls upon them all to perform that duty: but Man, above all visible creatures, is able to perform that duty intellectually, and intentionally, and fitted to be the common Procurator and High Priest of unintelligent creatures, intelligently on their behalf to present all their praises and acclamations to their common Creator, Lord, and Sovereign."—Sir Matthew Hale, *Primitive Origination of Mankind*, § i. c. i.; § iv. c. viii.

The Effects of the Fall on the Divine Image in Man.—"The Fall," though not strictly a Scripture term, expresses, perhaps, with sufficient significance, a Scripture idea; viz. man's degeneracy from a primitive state of rectitude in which he was created. The occasion and circumstances of his fall are fully related in Genesis, ch. iii., and the relation is alluded to as a thing to be taken literally, in several passages of the New Testament, as 2 Cor. xi. 3, "The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety." 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived; but the woman being deceived, was in the transgression." The first noticeable thing in the Scripture narrative, thus literally taken, is the introduction upon the scene of a new agent from the spiritual world. Now there are not wanting other indications of the real existence of such agents. It is not in Holy Scripture alone that we may trace it, but in the traditions and sentiments of almost every people. It cannot be without some foundation in fact, that we have both the testimony of tradition and the felt consciousness of the human spirit, everywhere, in favour of this scriptural hypothesis. Heathen nations, at the very height of their greatest civilisation, have ever shown themselves in fear of some secret enemy, whom it was necessary to

CHAP. VII.

propitiate with unnatural sacrifices; who will otherwise bear them malice and illwill; and who, at the best, is the author of many of the calamities, sicknesses, and miseries, to which they are continually subject. Towards this being—or rather towards a multiplicity of beings of this kind—there was none of that adoring reverence, that pious awe, yet secret inward trust, which we associate with any true idea of the Supreme Being, and which, in its proportion, would attach to any other being supposed of the like nature and attributes with Him. Here we find nothing to elevate, nothing to attract; but rather an abject terror, a forced reluctant service, reacting on the spirit to confound the very idea of worship, and to create a sense of alienation rather than true and wholesome fear. It is almost needless to say, that the existence and personality of evil spirits is abundantly confirmed in Scripture. Various are the testimonies on this point. In the Old Testament we may refer to Job, i. and ii.; to 1 Chron. xxi. 1; to Zech. iii. 1, 2; in all of which Satan is represented as taking a personal and active part in accusing, oppressing, and persecuting the faithful servants of God. But as these might be taken for symbolic scenes, and not actual realities, we must seek their true exposition in the language of the later dispensation. And here we shall find the most unequivocal references to the fact of Satanic agency, and the existence and operation of evil spirits generally. There is not an apostle, of whose writings we have any remains, but bears express witness to this fact. We have it from St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 8), "Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:" from St. James (iv. 7), "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you:" from St. John (1 John iii. 8), "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." The short Epistle of St. Jude speaks of "The angels which kept not their first estate, &c., and are reserved unto the judgment of the great day:" St. Paul (Heb. ii. 14), "That through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil:" and again (Eph. vi. 12), "We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness," τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας· *i. e.* "the legions of evil angels" (see Blomf., Wordw., Alford) "in heavenly places." Add those many instances in the gospel

histories of Satan tempting Christ; of demoniacal possessions; of Satan entering into Judas; of his final struggle with the Redeemer of Mankind, during the agony in the garden, and throughout the bloody scenes of the Cross: Matt. iv. 1—12; xv. 23. Luke xi. 14; xxii. 3. John xiii. 2; xvi. 11; xii. 31; xiv. 30. Take, lastly, the authority of our Lord himself, as recorded John viii. 44; "He (the devil) was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." And how He expressly fastens upon the person of the tempter the charge of being principally concerned in the seduction and ruin of mankind; "An enemy hath done this:" "While men slept, the enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat."—Matt. xiii. 25, 28, 39.

This existence of an Evil One solves, in fact, the whole difficulty; not, indeed, the difficulty of that remoter mystery, the origin of evil; but that which comes nearer home to ourselves, of the first connection of evil with the spirit of man, and how the infection of it came into the world. The circumstances are too well known to require further detail: the desire of knowledge by forbidden means, the fair look of the fruit, the flattered pride, the deceitful prospect of some good to be gained; the artful perversion of God's word, turning a gracious permission to "eat freely of all the trees of the garden," into a stern prohibition "not to eat" of the only one forbidden (comp. Gen. ii. 9, 16, with iii. 1): and, following upon this necessarily, the first suggestion of mistrust, and the whole train of disaffected, murmuring thoughts, supplanting the faith and trust of the too credulous victims; the spreading of the moral contagion from the woman to the man; the mutual reproaches; the anger and remorse; the shame and concealment; all these are but too well known to every reader. Thus came evil into the world. Thus an antagonism of allegiance to the one law and service of God. Thus the undermining of that love and confidence which ought to repose on Him alone. And all this effected by the art and subtlety of the Evil One!

Further back we are not permitted to go. But if we are right in attaching imperfection to all finite created beings, and thus even to the spirits which of old had left their first estate; the same capacity of error which now showed itself in man, must, through

CHAP. VII.

some process unknown to us, have similarly determined itself in those other created beings to actual error, which became the root of a rebellious spirit, and eventuated in actual disobedience, and in the loss of heaven. Once broken out, the consequences of sin must irretrievably go on, and the bitter consequences be experienced. It may, however, be with sin, as it is with diseases. Its existence may not necessarily involve its universal diffusion, nor even its endless perpetuation. The consequences of it may not merely be penal and judicial, but in the end remedial and salutary. Other orders of angelic natures, and those also who stood firm while the rest rebelled, may be put more effectually on their guard by their experience in others of the fallibility of created wisdom, the extreme danger of setting up a law of self-will, and the necessity of leaning more on the succours of Divine grace.

It more concerns us, perhaps, in a practical sense, to mark for ourselves the consequences of the sad introduction of evil into the world which is our own habitation. To the general depravation of all our faculties — to an infused moral weakness and blindness — we must add a positive bias to evil of the corrupt wills and affections of our nature. The author we have before quoted — one who was truly a practical Christian, as well as versed in all the niceties of human law — says, "Although the fall of man did neither alter the essential constituents of mankind, nor wholly raze out the engravings of those common notions, sentiments, and rational instincts, that were in them; yet it did in a great measure impair and weaken them, and brought in a very great deordination and discomposure, setting up the lower faculties in rebellion against the superior, so that the wiser and more moderate part of mankind were forced to set up laws and punishments, to keep the generality of mankind in some tolerable order." — Sir Matthew Hale, *Origination of Mankind*, § iv. ch. vii. "Hitherto," says another, "man had known good positively as the will of God, and evil only negatively as the neglect of that will. . . . . Now the pure vision of truth was obscured by the intruding phantom of moral and intellectual falsehood, and the will was liable to a spiritual influence of evil," (quite distinct from the rebellious power of the appetites and passions—what he afterwards calls "a positive idea of evil,")

which bound it down to a law contrary to the law of God."—Barry, *Introd. to Study of Old Testament*, ch. ii. p. 84, 103.

"In man," writes a bishop of our Church, "as he was originally created, there was no natural impediment to a perfect conformity of his will and affections with the will of God. In man, since the fall, such an impediment manifestly exists. His appetencies and affections are now at variance with each other and with the Divine will; so as to realise that distressing picture which St. Paul delineates, Rom. i. 18, 19: 'I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do.'"—Van Mildert, *Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn*, 1831, vol. i. Serm. 8.

There seem, indeed, to be different degrees in which different constitutions are affected by the strength of sin. It is not by any means an easy, if a possible task, to distinguish in all cases between what is due to defective education and habits, to external circumstances, and other natural causes, and what to nature and constitution. We may more safely rest on the declarations of the Apostle (Rom. iii. 23), that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God:" *i.e.* though the degrees of sin be not by any means alike in all, yet to one count in the general charge all must plead guilty, viz. that of living contentedly, perhaps, below the real end of their being, of not giving the first place in their hearts, the first-fruits of their understandings, and all other faculties, to God; not "seeking first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," in an entire and cheerful conformity of their wills to His divine will;—and thus it holds equally true of the more decent and respectable, as of open and notorious offenders, that they have "*come short of the glory of God*," the image in which they were made, and that after which they may be renewed. Nay, even the best of men may adopt the prayer of the publican (Luke xviii. 13), "God be merciful to me a sinner." It seems that the will of man requires time to bring it into that state of discipline and conformity to the Divine will which the order of the Divine government demands. For it is not intended to crush that will, and to force upon the creature a reluctant service. The pliability of a sycophant obedience is no

CHAP. VII.

more contemplated than the proud attitude of an independent self-will. If obedience be rendered, it must be of a sort that becomes a rational and intelligent being; one that is based on a true relation to God, and a right appreciation of that relation; one that, in this manner, pervades the whole mind, and springs spontaneously from the heart; an obedience, not blind to the exact nature of its obligations, nor to the reasonableness of the call to duty, nor to the advantages which attend its performance; yet, at the same time, an obedience, accompanied with the unfaltering acknowledgment of the supremacy of the One Great Maker of all, and of His alone right to order all things after the good pleasure of His will. It is, in short, the spirit of love to Him that is intended to be evoked by all the measures of discipline to which the creature, as such, seems necessarily subject. This, and nothing short of this, is the ideal of a true obedience. The trials which may be necessary for the discipline and perfection of such a disposition must be received and borne with a patience and fortitude commensurate with the end which they are designed to work out. Trials of this kind, together with the study of God's word and works, and the faithful use of the means of grace, will be found the best outward food and nutriment of this love to Him, while the Spirit of God will nourish and cherish it within, by the secret light and warmth of His own Divine teaching, till it becomes an essential and enduring element of character, fitting its possessor for the never-ending enjoyment of a higher and better state, when the present state of trial shall have passed away.

CHAP. VIII.

The Mosaic Order of Creation concluded.

Οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἰουδαΐζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν προτιμῶντας εἴγε δύναιντο σχόλαζειν. Concil. Laodicen. Can. xxix.

"Both names are dear and blest;
In each a meaning lies;
From making—God did rest,
In saving—Christ did rise.

"As warp and woof enfold,
God weaves in one the two;—
The strictness of the Old!
The freedom of the New!"

Monsell.

We had occasion, in our review of the "sixth day," to draw attention to the number of objects which, even on the most favourable supposition (viz. that of remitting to the fifth day the rest of the animal creation), would seem to be crowded into this following day. The "deep sleep which fell upon Adam,"[1] and to which we are bid to refer the first origination of Eve, must clearly be taken as part of that day's work, if we take the first chapter for our guide, which assigns to one and the same time the

[1] Ch. ii. 21.

CHAP. VIII.

creation both of Adam and Eve. Whether the remainder of the events (chap. ii. 15—20) are to be ascribed to the same interval? or when our first parents were placed in the garden of Eden? when the commandment was given them which prescribed that they might eat of every tree, save only the tree of the knowledge of good and evil? and when "every living creature" was "brought before Adam" to receive its appropriate name,—are more doubtful points. They might well be thrown forward to form part of the occupation of the subsequent week or weeks, without violence to the text, by simply adopting the slight alteration before mentioned and approved by Patrick and other commentators in the rendering of chap. ii. verse 18, "And the Lord *had* said," instead of "And the Lord said." Bishop Patrick says: "It required some time for Adam to be acquainted with all other creatures, and to impose names upon them. When they were brought into the garden, we cannot but think they walked about it, and took such a view of it as to be convinced, by the bountiful provision God had made for them, they had no reason to complain of the small restraint He had laid upon them. All which could not be performed so speedily as some have imagined; for though God can do what he pleases in an instant, yet man cannot, and God Himself did not in one day create the world."[1] We only renew the subject here, to illustrate the difficulty of distinguishing

[1] Patrick on *Gen.* iii. 1.

the time into exact days, even when we come to those easier parts of the narrative, where the imagination is no longer oppressed and overwhelmed with the attempt to follow the first opening burst of the wide field of creation. It may also help to show us the real grounds there are for assigning to each day, during that early state of the world, some more considerable length than the twenty-four hours that constitute our present day.

In a former chapter we noticed the twofold hypothesis, which explains the days either (1) as natural days, or (2) as indefinitely long periods, corresponding to those in which the great geological strata were deposited. There are two other views, viz. (3) that which would lengthen the intervals from evening to evening, by supposing the days to have exceeded at first the twenty-four hours of present time, but yet to have been natural days. And (4) the vision-theory of *Hugh Miller*[2], which

[1] Dr. Kalisch, in the account he gives us in his learned *Commentary on the Pentateuch* of this vision-theory, has extracted chiefly from the more fanciful parts of Mr. Miller's work: nor can we by any means agree in the justice of his criticisms, either of Hugh Miller or of the other conciliators of Scripture and Geology. (See below, pp. 274—279 and notes.) Dr. Kalisch says: "We see ourselves introduced into an untrodden recess of the Midian desert; here we behold Moses; a great and terrible darkness falls upon the prophet; he sees the Divine Spirit moving on the waters; he hears the words, 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;' unreckoned ages pass on; he hears again the creative voice—'Let there be light;' myriads of heavy, sunless days elapse; the dim light sinks beneath the undefined horizon; it again brightens; Moses sees that the lower stratum of the heavens, occupied in the previous vision by seething steam, is clear and transparent, and only in the

CHAP. VIII.

we shall endeavour briefly to describe. From the fact of Moses speaking according to appearance, as

upper region do clouds appear. Darkness descends for the third time upon the seer; but again the light rises, and there is no longer an unbroken expanse of sea; the white surf breaks, at the distant horizon, on an insulated reef formed, mayhap, by the Silurian, or Old Red coral zoophytes, ages before, during the bygone yesterday." Can this be thought a fair representation of Hugh Miller's conception, as to the *modus revelandi*, in this grand scene of creation? For ourselves, we have read him very differently; nor can we better assent to the somewhat severe criticism which follows:—

"In this manner," he continues, "the author, though with a rare charm of fascinating eloquence, carries out the visions of the six days. Do such soaring flights of fiction demand refutation? They lie beyond the pale both of science and criticism, in a sphere where reason willingly resigns the sceptre to fancy!" It is, perhaps, to be lamented that Hugh Miller should have attempted to depict the *manner* in which a vision *might be conceived* to have taken place; and not contented himself with the simple hypothesis of a vision taking place in fact, and what was the subject of it. We prefer that plainer account of the matter in which he calculates the time necessary for the cooling down of a red-hot surface of molten rocks, whereof the crust of the earth is, on all hands, considered to have at first consisted: a condition of our planet which, he justly observes, would turn, for many ages, the superincumbent waters into a dense mass of steam (p. 182). "What, in such circumstances," he asks, "would be the aspect of the scene? It would be simply a blank, in which the intensest glow of fire would fail to be seen at a few yards' distance. An inconsiderable escape of steam from the safety-valve of a railway engine forms so thick a screen, that, as it lingers for a moment in the passing opposite the carriage windows, the passengers fail to discern through it the landscape beyond. A continuous stratum of steam, then, that attained to the height even of our present atmosphere, would wrap up the earth in a darkness gross and palpable as that of Egypt of old,—a darkness this which even a single ray of light would fail to penetrate." . . . "Nor would a planet covered over for ages with a thick screen of vapour be a novelty even yet in the universe. It is questionable whether a human eye on the surface of Mercury would ever behold the sun, notwithstanding his near proximity; nor would it be often visible, if at all, from the surface of Jupiter. This planet, though it is thought his mountains have been occasionally detected raising their peaks through openings in his cloudy atmo-

when he speaks of the sun and moon as the "two greater lights," this author infers that he was not bound, by the nature of the revelation which he received, as to the literal words of his narrative; but that a *vision* of the past being preternaturally conveyed to him, he was left to describe it *optically*, and as common observers would do when any ordinary scene is presented to their sight. In short, that Moses describes his impressions merely of what he saw, these impressions being taken from the vision which he received, similarly to what

sphere, is known chiefly by the dark, shifting bands that, fleaking his surface in the line of his trade-winds, belong not to his body, but to his thick, dark covering." (Pp. 176, 177, 182.)

These plain statements seem to ourselves of sufficient force, without calling in the aid of poetic rhapsodies to help out the idea. But, indeed, Mr. Miller himself prefaces the passage quoted by Dr. Kalisch with the remark:—"Such a description of the creative vision of Moses as the one given by Milton of that vision of the future which he represents as conjured up (!) before Adam by the archangel, would be a task rather for the scientific poet than for the mere practical geologist or sober theologian." (P. 187.)

When Dr. Kalisch remarks,—"It is very difficult to conceive by what miracle Moses could have enjoyed that extraordinary privilege which this theory claims for him? and how he could actually have seen, in a great air-drawn panorama, the creation?" &c.—it was surely by no other sort of miracle than that which "caught up St. Paul to the third heaven" (2 Cor. xii. 1—4), or "opened a door in heaven" to St. John (Rev. iv. 1): such, too, as, amidst "blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the voice of a trumpet, and the sound of words," proclaimed the law, at another period, to Moses himself. He further ascribes many things to Mr. Miller which he never says; as, that "Moses was carried to some elevation above our planet!" "that he knew how many thousand years each *tableau* comprised," &c. &c. And can it be said with truth,—"A prophetic vision which reveals *past events* is without example or analogy in the whole range of the Biblical records? See Ezek. viii; Dan. ii. 36—38; Rev. xii. 1—4, &c. &c.

CHAP. VIII.

afterwards happened when he was enjoined to make the tabernacle and sacred vessels "after the pattern" of the vision "shewed to him on the mount." A sort of spiritual perspective might thus be supposed to have narrowed to his eye the full dimensions of all that he saw. A whole world of creatures, overspreading the surface of the earth for a long period, might reach his eye in the shape of some of its prevailing and most conspicuous forms, and the work of thousands of years might seem condensed into the compass of a single day. Applying this theory to the works of the three last days of creation, and omitting the rest as less concerned with geological considerations, he thus finds in the herbs and trees of the third day the representatives of the great carboniferous era. "The days," in fact, are removed altogether from the province of chronology to the province of prophetic vision: they are represented simply as parts of the exhibited scenery, or rather as forming the measures of the apparent time during which the scenery was exhibited. Moreover, "in the character of symbolic days they were as truly representative of the lapse of foregone periods of creation, as the scenery itself was representative of the creative work accomplished in these periods."[1] Accordingly, to the third of these days, and answering to the plants and trees of Gen. i. 11, 12, he refers the extensive flora and forests of the great Carboniferous era; to the fourth day (Gen. i.

[1] Testimony of the Rocks, p. 185.

14) the Permian and Triassic periods, which were marked by the decline of the previous (Palæozoic) forms, and the first partially developed beginnings of the Secondary ones; "while[1] the fifth and sixth may be held to have extended over those Oolitic and Cretaceous periods, during which the great sea-monsters and birds were created, and over those Tertiary periods, during which the great terrestrial mammals were created."

It will be observed that the whole of this theory is devised to meet and fall in with another and previous hypothesis of the days representing longer periods. If this be the true account of the matter, and if St. Peter's canon be here applicable (2 Pet. iii. 8), "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years," we think no theory could be safer, none more just, or more in accordance with all reasonable ideas of the nature of revelation. But to insist on it more strongly than this involves not a few difficulties, and many subtleties of geological observation, which may perhaps require time for their fuller scope and development. This Mr. Miller himself admits, and takes even some pains to show, that "plants do *not* precede the lower kinds of animals"[2] in the order of the observed strata, and yet here we find him interposing an entire creation of plants before the animals are once spoken of! He has met this objection by saying that the *prevailing features only* of each period are named in the Scripture narrative,

[1] Testimony of the Rocks, p. 175. [2] Ibid. pp. 17, 197.

CHAP. VIII.

and therefore such lower animals might have existed before, though not particularly mentioned. This part of the question can only, we apprehend, be settled by further researches in geology. As to the general idea, on which the whole argument of Mr. Miller rests, viz. of the revelations to Moses having taken place under the form of a vision, we believe it to be the most reasonable and simple account of the matter; and the way of speaking of it, into which any thinking mind would most naturally fall. It has the particular merit of opening wider than before the question of the duration of the days; and this, whether with Mr. Miller we regard them as actually representative of the successive long stages of the world's existence prior to man; or whether we see occasion rather to lengthen them into less considerable, but still very long periods, according to the circumstances of the case, periods more closely preliminary to the human æra, and subsequent altogether to the laying down of the great geological strata. It prevents our straitening and curtailing them into actual days of the present length; and this, to our mind, is all that it does. For that the great protozoic and other succeeding and preceding epochs are to be dated as altogether antecedent to the "six days' work," seems to us, after all, the most probable hypothesis, and most agreeable to the text of Scripture. Then came on the preparation of the earth for the immediate occupancy of man, which is said to have

been a "six days' work," but which we are at liberty, through the vision-theory, if indeed it helps us no further, to conceive of as having really occupied an indefinitely longer period. For ourselves we adhere to the belief, that the strata were disposed of during the great antecedent periods; and we see no need for finding them a place among the "days," or for otherwise disturbing the impression which would be conveyed to an ordinary reader by the literal text of Genesis. And without resorting to such a theory, elegant and attractive as it is, and well reasoned and supported by the author, we cannot forget that there is another, and perhaps a more ready way, of accounting for the longer duration of the twenty-four hours at that spring-time of the world; viz. the slower rotation of the earth round its axis. The remarks of Bishop Horsley are here worthy of our attention. "In what manner," he says, "the creation was conducted, is a question about a fact; and, like all questions about facts, must be determined, not by theory but by testimony; and if no testimony were extant, the fact must remain uncertain. But the testimony of the sacred historian is peremptory and explicit. No expression could be found in any language to describe a gradual progress of the work for six successive days, in the literal and common sense of the word 'day,' more definite and unequivocal than those employed by Moses; and they who seek to admit figurative expositions of such expressions as these, seem to be

CHAP. VIII.

not sufficiently aware, that it is one thing to write a history, and quite another to compose riddles. Moses describes the days as consisting of 'evening and morning.' By what description could the word be more expressly limited to its common meaning, as denoting that portion of time which is measured and consumed by the earth's revolution on her axis? That this revolution was performed in the same space of time in the beginning of the world as now, I would not over confidently affirm; but, whatever was its space, a day was still the same thing in nature—a portion of time measured by the same motion, divisible into the same seasons of morning and noon, evening and midnight, and making the like part of the larger portions of time, measured by other motions."[1] In confirmation of what is here observed, it is added by Bishop Gleig[2], "If the original state of the earth, when first formed out of the chaotic mass, was rest, and the laws of nature were the same as they are now, it is impossible to conceive, that her different motions can have commenced with their present velocity; for such a violent change from rest to motion would have reduced the globe a second time to chaos, and shaken it into atoms. The annual and diurnal motions of the earth must indeed at first have been extremely slow, and gradually accelerated till they reached their present velocity."

[1] Horsley, *Serm.* III. on Mark ii. 27.

[2] Annotations on Stackhouse, b. i. c. iii.

Chap. II. *vv.* 2, 3. *The seventh Day.*

v. 2. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made.

v. 3. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

Such are the words in which, according to the most received opinion[1], we have the first institution of the Sabbath. This was not, however, the universal opinion of the early Fathers, and is open to some dispute. Of one thing we may be certain, that "rest," in the literal sense of the term can never be applied to the Creator. It can only be in some relative sense,—a sense commensurate with the infinite distance which separates our ideas of the creature and of the Creator,—that we can with any reverence, and propriety of reason, adopt the description of the inspired writer, that "God rested from all his work." The Chaldee version renders it, "God was delighted with," — *i.e.* He regarded with satisfaction and complacency — "the work which he had made;" according to that of the Psalmist, "The glory of the Lord shall endure for

[1] In Suicer we find, *for* this opinion, Epiph. *De Hæres.* lib. li; Theodorus; Chrysostom; Theodoret, *Quæst.* xi. *in Gen.:—against,* Tertullian; Athanasius; Euseb., *Præp. Ev.* lib. vii. § 6; John Damascenus, *Thesaurus,* in voce Σάββατον. Among later commentators, *for,* Corn. à Lapide, Masius; *against,* Bochart, Estius, Vetablus. Vide Poli *Synops. ad Gen.* ii. 3. To the latter we have to add, among the moderns, Paley.

CHAP. VIII.

ever: the Lord shall rejoice in his works."[1] Any material idea of rest is quite set aside by that single declaration of our blessed Lord, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."[2] By some, who would take the expression more literally than the Chaldee version, the "rest" is explained as a suspension or discontinuance of the earthly creation;—the great work of ordering, upholding, and governing the universe remaining, as ever, in full operation. At least, they say, we must avoid the idea of labour and fatigue, which can only apply to the creature; and understand a *relative* rest, or termination of the six days' work. It appears surprising that another idea of "rest" has not, that we are aware of, been adduced in explanation of the passage; though it is an idea of frequent occurrence in analogous passages of Scripture, and is certainly not by any means incompatible with our highest and most reverential idea of the Divine Being. When the ark of the tabernacle was set down at any halting-place during the march through the wilderness,—or in later times when it was carried from city to city, or to its ultimate destination on the Mount,—the language of Scripture was, "Here will I dwell, and this shall be the place of my *rest*." "And when it rested, he said, Return, O Lord, to the many thousands in Israel."[3] Now if a place may be said to furnish a "rest" for the

[1] Ps. civ. 31. [2] John v. 17.
[3] Ps. cxxxii. 14; Num. x. 36.

Most High,—because he there receives the worship of his people and the glory due to his Name;—for the like reason, assuredly, and with the like condescension to the material apprehensions of men,—may a *day* be spoken of as the day of his "rest," on which He receives such worship, and which is specially set apart for the same. And such, it seems, was the "seventh day;" and therefore God not only "rested" on it, but also "blessed and sanctified it" to all future generations of the world. There is a difference in the Hebrew and Bible version, at that memorable passage in the fourth commandment of the law of Moses, which is not marked in the Prayer-book version; for, whereas in the latter the words run, "Wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it," the Hebrew and Bible versions have it[1], "The Lord blessed the *Sabbath*-day, and hallowed it:" which leads to the idea, that it was not specially the seventh day of the Jewish Sabbath which received a Divine blessing, and was peculiarly set apart for Divine worship, but "the Sabbath" generally, *i. e.*, *one day in seven*, which might be variably fixed, according to the altered propriety of the times.

If from the institution of the Sabbath, we proceed to inquire how far it was observed from the beginning, we find at once several traces of a public form and stated place of Divine worship; variously called in Scripture the "face of the Lord;" "the house,—

[2] Ex. xx. 11.

CHAP. VIII.

the altar,—the presence of the Lord,"—"where God records his name,"—"where men call upon the name of the Lord,"—"where the Lord gives his blessing,"[1] and as there was a stated place, so we doubt not there was a stated time; and this was, most likely, the seventh day. "Seven days" seems, accordingly, spoken of, as a marked and recognised division of time. "Noah sent forth a dove," we read; "and he stayed yet other *seven days*, and sent forth the dove, which returned not again unto him any more." The law to Abraham runs, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you;" that is, *seven days* after the child is born he shall receive that rite. Again, "Joseph made a mourning for his father *seven days*." Among the heathen nations we have not, perhaps, the same evidences of this weekly division of time. But in Hesiod some obscure tradition of it occurs, where he speaks of the seventh day (of the month) as specially sacred, because thereon "Apollo was born of Latona,"[2]—a tradition in some degree connecting the sacredness of the number with an indistinct notion of the creation as the reason and occasion of it." These notices of a weekly subdi-

[1] Gen. iv. 3, 14, 16; viii. 20; xii. 8; xiii. 4, 18; xxviii. 16, 17; Ex. xx. 24, &c. &c. "When Moses erected the tabernacle, it was *tanquam recepti moris*, as a thing of custom, and as mankind by tradition had learned to accommodate the worship of their God, by appropriating some place to that use."—Mede, *On the Reverence of God's House.*

[2] . . . . καὶ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ
Τῇ γὰρ Ἀπολλῶνα χρυσείορα γείνατο Λητώ."
Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμ.

And Eusebius quotes from Linus:

vision of time, however rare in profane writers, and scattered even in the sacred history, are yet sufficient to turn the balance of probability in favour of the opinion which traces the original institution of the Sabbath to the first beginning of mankind. It acquired a fresh sanctity under the law of Moses. It is first distinctly mentioned on the occasion of the congregation of Israel murmuring in the wilderness for want of bread, when a miraculous supply of manna was sent them from heaven. On the sixth day it was provided that a double quantity should be sent; and whereas on all common days the manna would not keep till the morning, on the seventh day it was miraculously preserved; and Moses said to the people, "This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord."[1] Paley, with others, considers this transaction in the wilderness to have been the first actual institution of the Sabbath; but considering the traces of it which have been adduced from the history of the patriarchal times, it seems rather probable, that the double provision on the sixth day had reference to an already existing division of time into weeks, and consequently to some previous, though faint and ill-observed, distinction of the seventh day.

Ἑβδόματῃ δ' ἠοῖ τετελεσμένα πάντα τέτυκται.—*Præp. Evang.* xiii. 12. Hesiod lived B.C. 900, *i.e.* 400 years after Moses, and 2500 after the Creation, according to the shorter reckoning of the Hebrews; according to Hales, 3900 years.

[1] Ex. xvi. 23.

CHAP. VIII.

With the abolition of the whole Jewish ritual, their Sabbath also, as regard their own peculiar observance of it, was abolished. Christ claimed to be "the Lord of the Sabbath;" and strictly as he bound himself to fulfil the whole law for man, he began even in his own time to relax the severities of Jewish and Pharisaical observance. But yet, as regards the original Divine sanction, and the principle of setting apart days of peculiar sanctity to God's immediate worship, this day was not and cannot be abolished. Christ, in what he taught, both by precept and example, dealt with the Sabbath in no other way than he dealt with all positive rites and ceremonies. He maintained them in their reasonable and well directed use; he exposed them as the subterfuges of the hypocrite and the Pharisee, when, upon plea of observing them, they overlooked the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. To remind men of this great principle, and of the danger of resting in the mere outward rite, or of substituting a legal righteousness for a spiritual law of life,—the great Christian festival was altered from the seventh, or last day of the week, and observed on the first day. The frequent meeting of Christians on this "first day" of the week, was alone an intimation, that they received some express injunctions to that effect from their Divine master. But there wanted not reasons in the very nature of the the case. On that day He himself rose from the

dead: in the week following he appeared amongst them, and showed himself to the twelve on the same day; and on the same, again, the promised gift of the Spirit descended upon them at the great feast of Pentecost. It appears from various passages in the Acts, that, while they thus celebrated the first day, they continued for a time to observe the seventh also, *i.e.* the Jewish Sabbath. The Apostles Paul and Barnabas frequented on that day the synagogues of the Jews[1]; and we elsewhere learn that the Jewish Christians in many places felt themselves still bound to the observation of their ancient Sabbath. Ignatius, in the second century, writing to the Magnesians[2], warns them against the Judaising method of observance, and bids them rather to make the Sabbath, a day "for the study of God's word, and for quiet employment, and not (as the Jews seem to have kept it) for mere bodily rest, for eating stale food, and measuring the distance they walked, sometimes even for idle dancing and frivolity,"[3] "After the Sabbath," he adds, "every lover of Christ is bound to celebrate the Lord's Day." We have thus a broad distinction at first kept up between the days of Jewish and Christian observance. The

[1] Acts xiii. 14, 42; xvi. 13.

[2] Ep. ad Magnes. It is in the same passage that he calls the Lord's day "the queen and prince of all days:" *τὴν κυριακὴν, τὴν ἀναστάσιμον, τὴν βασιλίδα, τὴν ὕπατον πασῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν.—Patr. Apostol.* vol. ii. p. 105 (ed. Russell).

[3] Patres Apostol. vol. ii. p. 103.

CHAP. VIII.

famous testimony of Justin Martyr is to the same effect. "On the day called Sunday, there takes place an assembly of all the dwellers in the cities and country to the same place, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time admits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the presiding minister delivers by word of mouth, the admonition and exhortation to the imitation of these good things. After this we all rise up together and offer prayers; and when we have ceased from prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water; and the president offers up prayers as well as thanksgivings, according to his power, and the people signify their assent by saying, Amen. And the distribution of the consecrated elements, and the reception of them by each takes place, and they are sent by the deacons to those who are not present. And those who are in good circumstances and are so inclined, each according to his own purpose, give what they think fit; and that which is collected is deposited with the president, and he assists the orphans and widows, and those who are in want, from sickness or any other cause, and those who are in bonds, and sojourners (being strangers), and, in short, provides for all who are in necessity. And we all jointly make the assembling together on the Sunday, because it is the first day, on which God, having changed darkness and inert matter, created the world, and Jesus Christ our Saviour rose again

from the dead; for on the day before Saturday they crucified him, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, having appeared to his Apostles and disciples, he taught these things." At what time the sanctity, as it were, of the seventh was, by general agreement of the Church, transferred to the first, we have no precise account. It seems to have been a natural result of circumstances, and particularly of that gradual decay of the Jewish polity, which followed the destruction of their city and temple. That by degrees the Sunday, or first day of the week, took the place of the other in the estimation and practice of the Christian Church, there can be no doubt. It was made a public law under the first Christian Emperor[1], that none but necessary works should be done on that day, which was to be called, as of old, the Lord's day. And St. Augustine says[2], "it was called by that name, on purpose to teach us, that it ought all to be consecrated to the Lord." Its other name of Sunday was derived from what we before noticed out of

[1] See Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 8; Niceph. lib. vii. c. 46. The Lord's day (κυριακὴ ἡμέρα) was not a new name given by Constantine. We saw it before in Ignatius, see p. 259. See also Rev. i. 10.

[2] "Ut ipso nomine docerent, illum totum Domino consecratum esse debere."—August. *Serm.* xv. "Ideo sancti doctores Ecclesiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici Sabbati in Dominicum diem transferre, ut quod ipsi in figurâ, nos celebraremus in veritate."—*Ib.* quoted by Wordsworth, *Greek Testament,* Matt. xxviii. 1. Dr. Wordsworth elegantly and justly observes: "The Jewish seventh-day Sabbath died and was buried with Christ, and rose again with Him the first day of the week, and became the LORD'S DAY."

CHAP. VIII.

Hesiod, that the Greeks were supposed to dedicate this day to Apollo, or the *Sun*. But by whatever name we call it, there is something remarkable in the coincidence that it was really to Christians, what the seventh was to Adam,—the *first* in their new career of hopes and duties. In reference to the works of creation, it was indeed the seventh;—and as the seventh, it might have acquired fresh sanctity to the Israelites, through the events in Egypt; but to Adam, the representative of the whole Church, it was—as it is to that Church itself—the *first day*. He had never before risen to the labours of a working day; but he is called from the first to consecrate the beginning of his days, and the first fruits of his thoughts and affections to God. And so it is now. Christ on that day became the first fruits from the dead. On the same, He sent down the first fruits of the Spirit. Christians, therefore, following the order of the benefits received, have adopted the same day, and constantly observe it, in the spirit though not after the letter of the law given to the Church under the elder covenant, to celebrate the gifts and blessings of the New. They find in it, almost unconsciously, the fulfilment of the Psalmist's words, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it."

Concluding Observations.

The writings of Moses hold no ordinary place in sacred literature. They exhibit the commencement of a scheme[1] imperfectly developed at first, but running through and pervading the whole course of Scripture. They furnish the first link in the great chain of revelations which lead up, by gradual and successive stages, to the establishment of Christianity itself. In the promised seed of the woman—in the royal Priest Melchisedec—in the sacrifice of Isaac—in the eventful history of Joseph, the protector and preserver of the brethren who had betrayed and delivered him over to death—in the institution of the passover—in the whole office and character of the great Jewish Lawgiver, as well as in the sacred furniture and mysterious rites of the Tabernacle, we have the first glimpses, and the ever-growing types and shadows of the "greater prophet" that was to come into the world. And all these are recorded by Moses: on the veracity of his account they all depend for their Divine

[1] In Mr. Currey, *Hulsean Lectures*, 1851, and Barry, *Introduction to Old Testament*, this part of the subject will be found ably and fully discussed.

CHAP. VIII.

origination or historic truth. But for that truth we need not fear. It is guaranteed to us by the known jealousy with which, for many hundred years, the Jewish nation guarded their national records, and the pride with which they cherished their national distinctions. It is confirmed by the testimony of later writers, sacred and profane, as well as by a comparison[1] of the earlier traditions of other countries, concerning, particularly, the flood, the ark, the first seats of civilisation, Abraham, Moses himself, and the Kings of Israel.

There is another kind of evidence which deserves to be considered, viz. the manifest harmony subsisting between the several parts of the Mosaic revelation and the more perfect features of the Christian; a harmony only to be accounted for by regarding them as parts of one and the same design, prepared and executed by one and the same designing Mind, though not developed at once nor within the compass of a single age. That same Tabernacle and its sacred rites and furniture—those complicated ceremonies of the Levitical law and priesthood—are absolutely stripped of all significance, till we regard them as so many preparatory steps towards the introduction of a better covenant, to be

[1] Most decided testimony is borne by Pagan antiquity to the chief circumstances of Patriarchal and Jewish history. See Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sac.* b. iii. ch. ii.—v.; Faber's *Horæ Mosaicæ,* vol. i. b. i. § 1; Jenkins's *Antiquity of Scripture,* vol. i. pt. 1; Harmer's *Observations on Scripture;* Sir William Jones's *Asiatic Researches;* Bryant's *Mythology;* Harcourt's *Doctrine of the Deluge.*

developed in time to come. But once possessed of this clue to their meaning, and coupling it with all subsequent links in the order of development, we observe such an intimate connection and dependence between the successive parts of the scheme, and such a convergency of the whole upon the future kingdom of Messiah, as necessarily implies the presiding and directing hand of Him who alone "sees the end from the beginning." The same long-expected Seed, who in the time of Abraham would have been looked for as a second Isaac, the loved and only son—in that of Moses, as a second Redeemer from, it might be, a worse than Egyptian bondage—would, in after times, be yet more distinctly imaged forth in the victories of Joshua, in the establishment of the throne of David, in the princely and peaceful reign of Solomon. The very troubles and reverses of the subsequent reigns, the frequent lapses and ultimate degeneracy of the people, the captivity to Babylon, and the final subjugation to the Roman power, tended still to throw light on a coming dispensation, which should far surpass in excellence the brightest times of Judaism, and to prepare the minds of the people for the advent of a spiritual in contradistinction to a temporal Messiah. But how astonishing a fact, that in One Divine Person all the various types and shadows should be found at last to centre, and to receive a full accomplishment! How difficult for man, how impossible for the most artful and accomplished im-

CHAP. VIII.

postor, to have framed even the semblance of a character in whom all these requirements should meet! And it was not merely that the temporal should adumbrate the spiritual; not merely that men should gaze on the strange phenomenon of so many types being realised, and so many prophecies fulfilled;—but every stage in the long series of dispensations antecedent to the coming of Messiah was in reality a distinct process of preparation for it. Every fresh dispensation was paving the way, and breaking up the ground over different parts of the world; it was preparing fresh channels and facilities for the future spread of the Gospel of Christ. The sojourn in Egypt was fitted to accomplish this purpose, by displaying in the midst of a great people the terrors of the Lord, and vindicating the superiority of the God of Israel over the vain idols of Egyptian worship. Something of the seeds of the true religion would hereby be sown abroad among the nations of the south. The wisdom and wealth of Solomon, attracting the admiration of distant potentates,—the captivity into Babylon, and the dispersion of the ten tribes,—would contribute to spread it further to the east and to the north. Subsequent dispersions by war, or settlements in peace, by bringing the chosen people into contact with other civilised nations, would help to carry out into distant lands the knowledge of the true God. And thus a highway would be cast up, and an ensign unfurled, to herald the coming of Him who was at

once the Son of David and the Hope of all the ends of the earth. Not less remarkable were the circumstances which, concurrently with these events, brought about the great prevalence of that beautiful language of the Greeks, the use of which was already so general, that even the Scriptures of the Old Testament were usually read in the Greek version of the Septuagint. The union of the civilised world, in most countries of the East and of the West, under the Roman sway, and the reign of a general peace, were no less providentially ordered to be another element in "that fullness of time," when, as an apostle declares, it pleased God to "send forth His Son," and "set up the throne of David for ever and ever." When we reflect on these things, when we observe closely the many successive steps, evidently prepared and designed by one uniform intelligence, to lead up to one great end clearly known and conceived beforehand; together with the many attendant circumstances, which were all overruled and directed to work out the same end; it is impossible not to acknowledge the finger of God, as the only reasonable account of so vast a plan, extending over so many ages, and conducted by such regular and consistent steps. The thing to be accounted for is not, as we before observed, a few scattered miracles here and there in the thread of the history,— nor even those by which the Messiah Himself announced His divine authority and the coming of His kingdom; nor yet the strange

phenomena which attended His death and resurrection, and the subsequent ministry of His apostles; but a steady and settled plan, clearly traceable from the embryo-state, so to speak, of the earlier covenants with Noah, with Abraham, and with Moses, up to the final consummation itself, when the mystery which comparatively "had been hid from ages and generations was now made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith."[1]

It would be highly interesting to trace the several parts of this settled plan, as it developed itself through all the stages of the sacred history. But this labour we must leave to others; and many have already gone before us in the work. In the foregoing pages it has rather been our object to select one particular stage, and to illustrate one leading part of the great dispensation. And this we have viewed, not so much in connection with the final end and purpose, as in its own peculiar features and character. We have directed our attention rather to the *internal* than to the external evidence for the truth of the revelation. The other is perhaps a wider and more fruitful field; but this has its interest and advantages too. It has called us to notice the first beginnings of that wondrous history of God's church, and how

[1] Col. i. 26; Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

the foundations of it were laid in the chosen people of old. We are here in company with Moses, the venerable leader and lawgiver of Israel, and one of the most noble and generous spirits of any age. We see him in contact, on the one hand, with the wisest and most civilised nation of his age, and, on the other, with all the waywardness, the weaknesses, and the follies of an infant people, undergoing the first rudiments of an education for a new and peculiar polity. We have seen him laying down at once his authority and his life, with the same meekness and self-possession with which he had employed both in the service of his country and of his God. We have examined the details of his life and character; we have tested the truth of his writings in several subordinate points of ethnology, history, and physical science, as well as in their higher bearing upon religion and morals. We have gone along with him to a remoter antiquity still: we have together touched the confines of space, and feebly counted the first pulses of time. We have advanced with him to the formation of the heavens and of the earth; we have seen how "The Lord established the world by His wisdom, and stretched out the heaven by His understanding." (Jer. li. 15.) To this we have added, lastly, the relation in which he stands to all subsequent revelation, and the long but well tempered chain which links the Mosaic with the Christian covenant. The same God which spake, in the bush

and in the cloud, to His servant Moses, spake afterwards "in divers manners to the prophets," and has "now at length spoken to us by His Son." But along the whole line of spiritual communication, there runs the evidence of an unity of design and purpose. One part fits on to another as no human art could have made it; and all have a manifest bearing upon the great consummation which the Gospel age brought in, and which is still in progress, till the earthly kingdom shall be exchanged for the heavenly. With this we might bring our subject to an end. But having in these last chapters introduced so much on the earlier records of creation, and as the connection of geological science with the Scripture statement is a subject on which considerable interest still continues to be felt, it may be desirable, before we conclude, briefly to recapitulate the substance of what has been advanced on that head, and what it is that we have principally designed to show.

In criticising, then, minutely the cosmogony of Moses, it has been our endeavour to vindicate rather the literal sense of it than any other; and at the same time to clear it from any real discrepancy with the latest discoveries of science. But we have not undertaken to decide that the literal sense is in all cases the only true, or the most correct one. We are disposed rather to admit, that in those things which transcend altogether the limits of human knowledge, and which lie beyond the reach of the tests that may be

applied to other subjects of inquiry from the collateral lights of history and philosophy;—that here there is often room for a more mystic sense, not possible for us altogether to unravel and bring down to the exact level of our finite understandings. And especially we would admit the possibility of the revelation having been made to Moses, in the shape of some vision, some mystic scene presented to the eye of his mind; in such a shape as would leave the description of it very much dependent on the subjective impression on the part of the individual influenced; rendering, therefore, too close a restriction of the words employed to their literal acceptation at once irreverent and absurd. We are, moreover, prepared to admit that the manner of the sacred writers in general is, to adopt the common phraseology of life, rather than the more exact language of an advanced and refined philosophy: to speak of the sun, for instance, as "rising" and "rejoicing to run his course"—and to designate the heavenly bodies after their apparent and not after their actual magnitudes:—that it was not their aim to enlighten the world in matters of science, so much as to lead up the mind from what is visible and material to what is invisible and spiritual:—to set forth the great truth of the unity and sovereignty of the One true God, who alone created the heavens and the earth:—that, though there is not so much room to speak after the appearance, with geological ob-

CHAP. VIII.

jects, as with astronomical; because in this case, the phenomena consist rather of things hidden from the view; of strata and fossil remains not obvious to the eye of a superficial observer,—yet if we place the subject before us in the light (which is no improbable light) of a vision, embracing different successive pictures of the earth's surface at different epochs—such a mode of speaking comes again into operation:—that, on the other hand, this very consideration of the objects observed by geology being not on the surface, might equally tell towards an opposite conclusion, viz. that such matters as the great geological strata, and as the supposed successive epochs of the world's existence under other conditions of life and climate and physical constitution, would not come under the cognisance of the sacred writer at all, but would be most naturally omitted altogether in an account concerning only that condition of the earth which comes under the eye, and which belongs to it as the seat and habitation of man.[1] Such being the

[1] The vision-theory, which we have before shown to be perfectly admissible in speaking of Divine revelations (see Chap. V.), has been with much ingenuity, and, indeed, with much force, applied by a writer of the day to support the geological view of the "days" being long periods. We should wish for space to do justice to the admirable pains and ability with which that writer has worked out his theory. He argues from the physiology of the fossil world, from the evidences there are of a comparatively long hazy period, during which no sun, like that of the "fourth" recorded "day" could possibly have illuminated the immense forests of ferns and all the products of the great carboniferous æra, much less the primeval waters and first emergent lands. The

opposite views, we have left the decision with others; under the conviction, that both are com-

great quantity of oxygen which would be suddenly discharged into the atmosphere upon the appearance of the solar light on the "fourth day" would account for the marked development of animal life and its many new varieties during the great Permian and Limestone period which then set in. But it would be in vain to attempt, in so narrow a compass, any adequate representation of all the arguments adduced by *Mr. M'Causland.* Suffice it to say briefly, that the common objection to this theory, founded on the precedence in observed nature of animal life to land-plants or vegetables, while the account in Genesis would seem to reverse the order, is most ably met, by observing that animal existence might very well be imagined to have been going on within the bosom of "the waters," unseen and unobserved, and therefore unrepresentable to the eye of the "Seer," so that, believing that Moses was enabled only to write what he saw, we are at liberty to infer, though it be not actually expressed, that certain forms of animal life were really co-existent with the primeval "waters" themselves, especially from the time when "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." The following quotations will sufficiently explain this writer's view:—"There is, moreover, a plain reason, which we learn from geology, for this somewhat indirect mode of announcing the submarine creation, so as not to be confined to any one of the days or eras of creation; and that is, that the organic remains of the Cambrian, Silurian, and Devonian strata show that the existence of submarine animals may have commenced, and in all probability did commence before the dawning of light on the deep, and was, we know, continued subsequent to that event, and that some of the species, viz. fishes, were not in existence until the commencement of the work of the third day. There are, in fact, three classes of submarine animals: first, zoophytes and bivalve molluscs, without visual organs, and which, therefore, *may have existed before light;* second, the higher classes of molluscs and crustaceans, furnished with organs of sight, and which must have come into existence *after the creation of light;* and third, the still higher class of vertebrate fishes. The first class was created on the first day, before the dawn of light; the next, on the second day, after the appearance of light; and the last we know to have come into existence contemporaneously with land vegetation, viz. on the third day of the creation. So that the creation of this portion of the animal world must have extended through three at least of the Mosaic days, and

CHAP. VIII.

patible with the text of Scripture: and though the latter is, we think, the simplest and most natural, there is also great beauty in the other, and it has been supported and advocated with much ability, and with the most laudable desire to maintain the authority of holy writ, by opening for it fresh points of contact with the advancing science of the age. At the same time we have no sympathy with—we altogether protest against—the coldness and unfairness of the view which would deny the duty and deprive us of the privilege of attempting any reconciliation at all between the two sides in question:—between the statements of Scripture and the observed facts of geology. The cosmogony

could not, therefore, consistently with truth and accuracy, have been announced as a separate item of creation, confined to any one of them; and had the Mosaic record declared that the submarine animals were created on the first, or on any single day of the creation, it must have been contradicted by geologists." "There is a further, and as it appears to us, a more satisfactory reason for the form of expression which has been adopted by Moses in this place for the structure of this portion of his narrative. The scene of the creation was, as we have already suggested, in all probability, communicated to the divine historian through the medium of a vision, and if so, he could only have recorded or described what had met his eye, or was communicated to his ear; and, accordingly, he records that part of the creation which he saw or heard, and not that part of it which he could not have seen or did not hear. He therefore announces the Divine Fiats which he heard, and the consequent dawn of light, the formation of the atmosphere, lifting up the clouds, and the appearance of dry land and vegetation, all of which he saw, omitting that which he could not have seen, viz. the submarine animals, and only announcing, with respect to them, what may have been communicated to his senses, as to Ezekiel in the vision of the valley of dry bones, that the Spirit (πνευμα) of God was moving on the waters, breathing life into them."

of Genesis has long stood the shock of advancing science, in the *astronomical* department. Here revelation has been harmonised with the conclusions of philosophy; and no violence, no fanaticism has been charged upon those who have interested themselves to trace out the harmony. Not Genesis only, but scattered passages throughout the sacred volume, depended on the issue of the trial; it was clear that they must stand or fall together under the test which the science of the astronomer [1] was prepared

[1] The most frequent reason for apparent discrepancies between Scripture and science is the necessity, in a Divine revelation, of accommodating the language to the ideas of men, so as to be intelligible in all times and countries, and under all conditions of human progress and society. (See some remarks on this subject in a former chapter, p. 132.) We add the following powerful illustration of the argument: "Science is constantly teaching us to describe known facts in new language, but the language of Scripture is always the same. And not only so, but the language of Scripture is necessarily adapted to the common state of man's intellectual development, in which he is supposed not to be possessed of science. Hence the phrases used by Scripture are precisely those which science soon teaches man to consider as inaccurate. Yet they are not on that account the less fitted for their proper purpose; for if any terms had been used adapted to a more advanced state of knowledge, they must have been unintelligible among those to whom the Scripture was first addressed. If the Jews had been told that water existed in the clouds in small drops, they would have marvelled that it did not constantly descend; and to have explained the reason of this would have been to teach atmology in the sacred writings. If they had read in their Scripture that the earth was a sphere, when it appeared to be a plain, they would only have been disturbed in their thoughts, or driven to some wild and baseless imaginations by a declaration to them so strange. If the Divine Speaker, instead of saying that He would set His bow in the clouds, had been made to declare that He would give to water the property of refracting different colours at different angles, how utterly unmeaning to the hearers would the words have been! And in these cases the expres-

CHAP. VIII.

to apply. The test was applied, and the Scriptures stood; their authority was unshaken by the result. A like trial is now challenged by the more recent discoveries in geology. And why the like harmony is to be despaired of; — why we are to desist from seeking it; — why it is to be denounced as folly, or looked upon as mere shuffling and "evasion," when such an attempt is made, we are utterly at a loss to cemprehend![1] There may not

sions, being unintelligible, startling, and bewildering, would have been such as tended to unfit the sacred narrative for its place in the providential dispensations of the world."—Whewell, *Indications of a Creator*, pp. 175, 176.

[1] Yet such is the language of the learned author of a recent critical commentary on the Pentateuch: "It is indeed a very convenient way of restoring harmony between the Bible and the natural sciences by asserting, that the production of the starry host, and the vast geological epochs, lie *before* the work of the six days; by making the first two verses a *carte blanche*, on which everything might be crowded that disagrees either with astronomy or geology, and by maintaining that the condition of the *earth*, such as it is at present, and as it is adapted for human habitation, is the sole object of our chapter." . . . . "But this is not to harmonise, but to separate." . . . . Such persons, "by a cowardly manœuvre, forsake the true arena of the dispute, and intrench themselves behind a few harmless verses." . . . . "Judicious criticism protests both against the stratagem and the argument."—Kalisch's *Commentary*, General Introduction, p. 50. Yet, he admits, "this is by far the most prevalent opinion among theologians" (p. 2). And again, "From very early times it has justly been supposed that the first verse of our Book describes the creation of matter, or of the universe in general, whilst the following part of the chapter treats of the arrangement and distribution of matter, of the formation of the earth, and of the beings which people it. This opinion was entertained by many of the early fathers of the church, and has been adopted by many later theologians and critics. *Most of the modern followers of this opinion* believe that an infinite interval of time elapsed between the creation of matter recorded in the first verse, and the formation of the universe (?)

be the same conspicuous visible phenomena to deal with in the case of geology. But the prin-

in its present admirable order, a period sufficiently extensive to account for the various and repeated changes both in the condition of the earth and the sidereal systems; so that, in fact, the first chapter of Genesis does not fix the antiquity of the earth at all" (p. 48). Nor do the expositors of the *Miller* school fare better with Dr. Kalisch: any thing like "creative pictures," "visions," "hieroglyphics," "panoramas of creation," &c. (p. 48), is intolerable in his sight. But while he will have nothing of "flights of fiction" and "fancy" in criticising Hugh Miller, in another place he makes poetry the whole genius and spirit of the Hebrew cosmogony, and spends many pages in explaining how poetically they conceived of nature, and how little they cared for the exactitude of science! (See pp. 19-27.) With the same consistency he tells us the sacred writers were bound to speak scientifically, and according to true matter of fact, in those parts where narrative was evidently intended (p. 50, § 10). And again (p. 28), "If the Scriptures are not *bonâ fide* truth, but in many points a convenient accommodation to prevailing absurdities and childish ignorance," (who says this of them?) "where can we with confidence say they are in earnest, and that their doctrines claim the authority of absolute truth? . . . . If the sublime acts of creation, as described in the first chapter, are not serious truths, of what other parts can we expect it? If a book which is intended as a *guide* and a *preceptor*, withholds, on many momentous questions, *designedly*, its better knowledge and convictions, it has necessarily forfeited, in a great measure, that esteem and confidence which alone secure its authority (p. 28). It is simply untrue that the Bible entirely avoids physical questions; it has, in fact, treated the history of creation in a most comprehensive and magnificent manner; it has evidently not withheld any information which it was in its power to impart" (p. 2). Thus the Hebrew writers, and especially those who claimed inspiration, were bound to divulge the whole secrets of nature, and relate boldly all the facts, which would clearly be equivalent to solving at once all the difficulties of science;—and yet we are told in another place they utterly abjured science, and spoke always after the popular mode of conception! "The Hebrews had no predilection for positive sciences. . . . . Though they excelled all nations in sublimity of thought, they were inferior to all in practical studies; if they obtained some scanty scientific results, they soon forced them under the dominion of religion, and made them assume an unsecular character" (p. 41). And who, we would again ask,

CHAP. VIII.

ciple is the same. There is the same reason in the one case as in the other, for seeking to reconcile the two sides of the account;—to inquire how far the statement tallies with the facts; or to what extent the Scriptures may have been purposely silent, and may have omitted to record the great primordial stages of the world's existence. The

are the writers who "make the Scriptures a convenient accommodation to prevailing absurdities?" (P. 28.) Who says "the sublime acts of creation, as described in the first chapter, are not serious truths?" Not, we can assure him, those whom he is opposing, and who simply affirm that it is here and there the custom of the Scripture writers, on intricate points, to adopt a popular phraseology; and who, far from ignoring the statements in Genesis, take them all for most liberal and "serious truths." It seems rather that our critic himself must have been in some poetic mood, when we find him seriously propounding such an explanation as the following, "That the Bible expressed, *in every respect, and on all subjects,*" (the italics are his own,) "what it considered (!) to be the truth." This personification of the Bible, or speaking of it, rather, as a "considering" machine, is somewhat curious and amusing. But to pass this, and to attend only to the substance of the remark: The assertion is, that the Bible way of speaking, whatever be the subject,—be it even physics or metaphysics,—is always strictly according to the fact; and that to condescend, in its language, to the ordinary way of speaking on such subjects would be a disparagement of its sacred authority. Contrast this with another declaration at p. 51: *The Bible,* "in this account of the creation, *expresses* facts which the researches of science cannot sanction, and which were the *common errors of the ancient world.*" Who is it now that imputes to the Scriptures "a convenient accommodation to prevailing absurdities and childish ignorance!"

We see much to admire in the goodly array of geologic facts which Dr. Kalisch has adduced, and even in the tone in which he seeks to soften down needless animosities. But we cannot accept the character which he endeavours to fasten on that large school of theologians, who have recognised in the first two verses of Genesis the expression of a time large enough to account for all unrecorded phenomena, but which yet have left an indelible impress on the rocks and fossil strata of the earth. We

vision-theory is certainly that which most brings into play, and draws most upon, the observed rule of the Scripture writers in matters of scientific detail, of speaking more according to the appearance than in strict agreement with the discovered nature of the things. If Moses saw the things in vision,—if a kind of distant prospect of them was presented to his spiritual eye,—there is no absurdity in believing, that he would have described them as he saw them; and just as he *has* described the sun and the moon, and as the motions of the heavenly bodies in general *are* described by the sacred writers. And whether he does this or not, we may be content to take his account as we find it; but not awkwardly and unnecessarily to impute contradictions where there are none; and to intimate the existence of some great blunder somewhere, such as the weak faith of mortals is ever apt to suspect in those who boldly take the side of revelation, though they cannot always find a ready solution of every difficulty that may occur. Till we hear of some better arguments than have yet been adduced against it, we shall not be deterred from entertaining the question of the harmony between Nature and Revelation, for which we have now been contending.

cannot agree to call it an "evasion," because they allow for what is *un*recorded, while they receive what *is* recorded as positive and "serious truth." Much less can we accept his own theory, which makes Genesis the mouthpiece of a great popular delusion of the time, upon the handsome excuse that it was doing its best, and not "designedly" giving circulation to error!

CHAP. VIII.

Let it bear ever so remotely on the claims of Genesis to be an inspired book, we cheerfully give it a place among the credentials of so important a history. We have seen the connection which subsists between that history and the final establishment of the Church of Christ; and this must ever give a fresh interest to the proofs by which the authority of its author, and his claims to inspiration, may be sustained and vindicated. With this view we have followed him in his life — we have examined the letter and endeavoured to extract the spirit of his writings; — we have viewed him in his individual character, in his office, and in his typical capacity; and, lastly, we have pointed out the relation in which he stood to all coming dispensations. To reflect on these things is to confirm our faith in Christianity itself. "The law was given by Moses," but there were not wanting even under the law some prospective indications of the "grace and truth which should come by Jesus Christ." And now, when that truth is established, we may well look back with continued admiration on the steps by which it was introduced, and by which the world was gradually prepared for its reception.

The laws and principles of the Gospel have, it is true, their foundations deeper than in the law given by Moses, or in the revelations imparted to him. They are firmly rooted in the depths of our nature, and, to a great extent, are a transcript of the "law

written in our hearts." The very central article of the Christian faith—the Son of God incarnate in the form and nature of man—finds its counterpart in the natural aspirations and yearnings of the humanity to reach and ally itself with the Divinity. Yet it has been the constant order and method of the Divine Providence to feed and draw out, as it were, the inward faith by outward signs and institutions. There has always been an objective teaching, corresponding to the inward testimony of conscience and the natural law of the mind. Such institutions were coeval with man. They began with him in Paradise, and have followed him along the whole line of his subsequent history. In Paradise there was given him the law of the Sabbath, the law of matrimony, and lastly, as a test of his obedience, and as an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty over him, the positive injunction to abstain from the fruit of the forbidden tree. In the time, and under the dispensation of Moses, such positive institutions came to the full. They had the additional object of prefiguring the promised seed, and they prefigured it with a force, and under a variety of emblems, unknown to any previous age. In the strange combination of offices in the same individual,—of Priest and Prophet, of Mediator, Ruler, and Judge;—in the typical sacrifices, and in the Lamb for burnt-offering, and in some other circumstantials of the law to which we have already adverted, Christ Himself stood

CHAP. VIII.

almost revealed to the view. Thus rich with prospective allusions to the future blessings of Sion was the covenant of Mount Sinai. And while the law of nature remained still in force—while the covenant with Abraham was as valid as before—(for, speaking of this covenant, the apostle says, "The law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul it, that it should make the promise of none effect,"[1])—men were taught above all to realise the time when the promised Seed should eventually arrive, and the connection of all past dispensations should fully appear. It was not till many hundred years afterwards that the time actually arrived. But no sooner was it come, than the consistency of the whole scheme of type and prophecy was clearly shown: the shadows disappeared, and the substance was realised. And now, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things which we see; for I tell you," says the Divine Redeemer himself[2], "that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear and have not heard them." Yet the full effulgence of the noonday light cannot wholly obliterate our recollections of the early morn. A grateful sense of the past is, on the contrary, calculated to kindle and to keep alive within us the hopes of what is yet to come. It stretches the understanding, and assists the imagination, and infuses the more confident

[1] Gal. iii. 17. [2] Luke x. 23, 24. Matt. xiii. 16.

assurance that God's purposes of love to His creatures will never fail, but that "He is faithful who promised," and that He will be true to His word towards all those who believe and trust in Him; that He will cause the Truth to prevail and triumph over every opposition, and the trials of His church to issue in unclouded happiness and unbroken peace.

Relation of Genesis to the remaining Books of the Pentateuch.—The transition from Genesis to the other books of Moses is a transition, for the most part, from patriarchal life and times to the next stage in the development of the great scheme, by which God, in His mysterious Providence, was preparing the world for the Incarnation and Kingdom of Jesus Christ. This was the establishment of the Theocracy among a people selected from the rest of mankind to be special channels for the transmission of Divine truth, and for the gradual disclosure of the Divine purposes. In the foregoing pages, though concerning ourselves chiefly with the earlier records, we have not failed to call attention to some features of the Jewish dispensation, and of the infant Theocracy as committed to the administration of Moses. In considering the life and character of that remarkable servant of God, we have had occasion to anticipate some little of Jewish history, at least so far as it is developed in the remainder of the Pentateuch. This may, perhaps, be our excuse for having omitted so much that is interesting in the Patriarchal times, much, too, that by the glimpses afforded us of a very early period of civilisation, and the genuine traits which every where abound of a pastoral and primitive simplicity, affords undesigned witness to the genuineness of the narrative, and consequently would be useful in confirming that "veracity of the book of Genesis" for which we have been contending. Rebecca coming to draw water for her father's sheep, who was a great chieftain in Haran,—the simple loquacity of the old servant Eliezer (Gen. xxiv. 15—27),—Rachel being found in the employment and office of a shepherdess (Gen. xxix. 9),—and, several ages after that, the seven daughters of Jethro, who was a

CHAP. VIII.

prince as well as a priest of Midian, "keeping," in like manner, "their father's flocks," and "drawing water for the cattle"—(Exod. ii. 16),—Esau and Jacob dressing the venison at their own fire, and waiting upon their father (Gen. xxvii. 31),—the sons of Jacob taking their humble offerings into Egypt,—"Carry down the man a present, a little balm, and a little honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts and almonds" (Gen. xlii. 11);—such are some of the well-known incidents of patriarchal life, and they are calculated, more eloquently than words, to convince us that the record was drawn from the life, and founded in undoubted fact; and this again, among other evidences, stamps its seal of truth upon the whole narrative in which these particulars occur. It has not, however, fallen within our limits to prosecute minutely this part of the Mosaic history. A gap has been left, rich in materials well calculated to help out our general argument, between the time of Adam and that of Noah, and again between Noah and the call of Abraham. But the preference has been purposely given to subjects presenting a wider scope for discussion, and about which difficulties are felt whose solution must always be matter of great interest,—difficulties in Ethnology, Early History, and Geology, together with some more strictly Theological questions which naturally occur. To these, it is hoped, due place has been given, and it has been found impracticable, compatibly with this object, to leave room for an orderly prosecution of the remaining subjects in Genesis.

A late and eminent writer on the Pentateuch, under which term it was not his intention to include the book of Genesis, being solicited (as he tells us) by his friends to include that book, gives the following reasons for declining the task: "The history of the *four last* books of the Pentateuch forms *one* subject perfectly distinct from the history of the book of Genesis, except so far as it is connected with the account of the fall of man in the grand economy of grace. The evidence of the divine original of the Mosaic law may therefore be clearly exhibited without including the consideration of the facts recorded in the book of Genesis. I add, that in the natural order of reasoning, the divine mission of Moses should be proved by its peculiar evidence, *before* the truth of the antecedent facts can be decidedly admitted, because the credibility of the facts recorded in this history must

always chiefly rest on the authority of their inspired historian, which I have here endeavoured to establish . . . . The great cause, however, why I have not attempted to comply with the suggestion of my friends is my inability to do so. The work they prescribe is on a subject of great importance and extent, and on which the daily increasing knowledge of Oriental history and literature, and the extension of physical and geological discoveries, are perpetually throwing new light."—Graves, *On the Pentateuch*, Introduction, pp. xii—xvi. It is evident that Dr. Graves looked to *Oriental scholarship*—probably to a learned comparison of the old traditional systems, the Vedahs and Sastras of the Hindoos, &c.—as one great means in store for illustrating the Mosaic annals of creation and subsequent events in sacred story. Cosmogonies of the ancients, and collections of the earliest national traditions handed down among the most celebrated peoples, have indeed been long before the world.[1] But the learned writer was looking, perhaps, for still greater light from this quarter; and, indeed, it may be reserved for future investigations to supply the desideratum which he felt. The opening up of commerce in the East, and the improved relations of civilised Europe with India and China, seem likely enough to stimulate inquiry, and to lead to a deeper acquaintance with Oriental literature in the original tongues. The work of Sir Emerson Tennent gives already fair promise that such will be the case. At the same time, much caution will

[1] See Cumberland's *Sanchoniatho;* Shuckford's *Connection;* Stillingfleet, *Orig. Sac.;* Maurice, *Indian Antiquities;* Sir J. Emerson Tennent's *Ceylon, its Natural History, Antiquities, &c.* In tracing the original of mankind in different countries, the ancients could do no more than make them *Ἀυτόχθονες*—the natural offspring of the soil—or else ascribe them to the union of *Οὔρανος* and *Γῆ* or of some other elements, the Sun and Water, &c. &c. But it is remarkable how almost universally their historians fell back upon some tradition of a *general flood.* Thus the Greeks began their world again with Deucalion, after a tradition derived from Hierapolis, according to Lucian; the Chaldæans from Xisuthrus, according to Berosus; the Hindoo mythology is said to be in a great measure founded upon a similar tradition; and, in short, we may trace the deluge in the popular mythologies all round the world. Vid. Le Clerc, *Notes on Grotius de Veritate,* lib. i. c. 16; Bryan's *Analysis of Ancient Mythology;* Harcourt's *Doctrine of the Deluge.*

CHAP. VIII.

always be required in instituting a comparison between the more sober and truthful relations of the Scripture narrative and uncertain traditionary legends, however adorned with poetry, and invested with the imaginary fascinations of an immemorial antiquity. And, moreover, it seems probable that the most valuable aids to inquiry will, after all, be found to come more from the labours and researches of the traveller than from the subtle arguments of the philosopher. Voices from the *tombs* are now joining on every side with voices from the *rocks*, to proclaim the Divine original of the Scripture records — to show, at least, (which is all that the advocates of inspiration ought reasonably to require,) that the sacred penmen so far enjoyed the privilege of the Divine co-operation as to be guarded from essential error in the substance of what they related, whether they collected the materials of it from human sources, or whether they received them by immediate illumination of the Spirit. These *evidences from fact* are most important collateral supports to the general truth of Scripture. They speak in clear and intelligible language to all, and tend to bring vividly to mind the reality of the whole narrative, whose minor circumstances are thus clearly established. And this reflects further upon the doctrines themselves. The circumstances with which these are interweaved,—(the outward vehicle, as it were, in which they are wrapt up and conveyed to the mind,)—having themselves found ready admission to the reason and understanding,— having won their way to our acceptance from the incidental marks of their reality,—justly gain for the more mysterious parts of the revelation a proportionably more ready and respectful hearing; and the great practical end is attained, which seems to have constituted the great purpose of inspiration when the peculiar style and method were adopted, which we find so observable in the Scriptures, viz. of engrafting doctrine upon history, and combining the two in strict practical connection.

From the remarks of Dr. Graves, it may further be inferred, that, if "the *four last books* of the Pentateuch" might justly be represented as "forming *one subject* perfectly distinct from the history of the book of Genesis," there can be no doubt that *Genesis itself forms a subject distinct from the four remaining books.* With equal truth it may be affirmed, that, amidst the

vast variety and amount of information which has been brought home from various quarters, and which has poured its light upon the mysterious page of Scripture, no small share belongs particularly to this book of Genesis. Here belongs much that has been discovered of the remains of Nineveh and of Babylon; the very head, it may be, of Nimrod, and the gigantic spoils of those ancient cities. Here the hieroglyphic forms and characters, which were once regarded as hopelessly locked up against the art of man to open or decipher; but which have found their interpreters in a Rawlinson, a Champollion, a Bunsen. It seems almost invidious to select names, where so many have joined the gallant band of travellers who have devoted themselves to the exploration of the East. Egypt has played its full part—has occupied, perhaps, the largest share in the wide field of antiquarian interest. In the glance we have already had occasion to take at the early history of that wonderful country, it was unnecessary to do more than identify, as far as possible, the statements of profane historians illustrative of the Scripture narrative of the Exodus. In larger works the student will find himself well rewarded, while he pursues on the map of that country the probable track by which the children of Israel made their retreat from the house of bondage; while he marches with them from the land of Goshen to the borders of the Red Sea, and halts where they stood for a while encamped on the seaside, on the dread night when their pursuers should perish in its waters, hedged in between the sea and the mighty host of the Egyptians. We will just notice a circumstance which seems to throw light on a point somewhat disputed of late years among the learned.

To the north of Mount Sinai there are found some very remarkable ancient inscriptions sculptured on the rocks, together with certain figures, which must either have been intended for hieroglyphic characters, or else been idly cut by the passing hand of the traveller, or whoever addicted himself to the pastime. Their history had long defied the skill of the philologist, when an ingenious theory was devised (see Mr. Foster's *Primitive Language*), which referred them to a peculiar mixed dialect, growing up probably during the sojourn in Egypt, and compounded of Egyptian and Arabic, (or Semitic). The majority of philologists, however (admitting their ignorance of the language), adhere to

CHAP. VIII.

the opinion that they are of greater antiquity than the time of the Exodus; they think the figures (and certainly the crosses), might have been added by some later hand, the latter probably by some wandering pilgrims within the Christian era. Considering that another "*valley of inscriptions*" (see on the map the *Wadi Mokatteb*) occurs on the Egyptian side of the water,—with similar characters engraven on the rocks, and the whole valley bearing precisely the same name,—occurring moreover on the same line of route between Memphis and the East (though it is scarcely probable that the Israelites themselves came by that way, for they most likely started from a point considerably northward of Memphis); yet, considering all the circumstances of similarity, may it not incline us to ascribe a similar origin to the two? It might have been the work of those Arab tribes, from whom, it seems, the Shepherd Kings were descended, or it might have been purely an Egyptian work; for it is an undoubted fact that the Egyptians quarried the stone for many of their chief national works—their temples and their palaces—from the mines of Mount Sinai and the adjacent mountains; and that the traces of their miners are still visible in that part of the Arabian peninsula. Setting apart this controverted point, however, we cannot pass the mention of the *Wadi Mokatteb* of Mount Sinai without adverting to its important bearing on the whole Scripture account of the Exodus. When we find these valleys and mines of Arabia lying on the natural route by which caravans would travel or even armies march, on the great highway between the adjacent continents of Africa and Asia, we cannot but be struck with the circumstance as giving great additional interest and reality to that account. For it shows that the scenes referred to were not some obscure unvisited deserts and corners of the earth, where no foot of traveller was ever likely to tread, and which might afford unlimited scope for imaginary difficulties and dangers. On the contrary, all was enacted on ground whose localities were patent to public observation and inquiry. Inaccuracies of description, though slipping almost accidentally from the pen, would have raised suspicion at once. There was, in short, but one way to be secure against the suspicion of fraud and imposture, and that was by following truth, and truth only, in every statement; and now, when we

find the sacred narrative in every respect answering to these tests of historic and geographical research, we claim for its inspired historian, by this fresh argument, the character of clear and undeniable truth. And if this may be said of that portion of the narrative which concerns the Exodus and the wanderings of the Israelites in the wilderness, there is abundance of similar testimony, as we follow them on into the land of their settlement, and pursue the thread of the inspired record through the remaining period of their history. But here, as we are beginning to overstep the limits of the Mosaic portion of Scripture, we must bring our labours to an end. To those who are desirous of pursuing and improving this branch of the subject, we would recommend, among useful works of reference, particularly the following:—Calmet's *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols., 4to.; Kitto's *Bible Cyclopædia*, 2 vols., 8vo.; Kitto's *Pictorial Bible*, 3 vols., 8vo.; Kitto's *Pictorial History of Palestine*, 2 vols., 8vo.; Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Travels of St. Paul*, 2 vols., 4to.; Robinson's *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 4 vols., 8vo.; Foster's *Primitive Language*, 3 vols., 8vo.; Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, 1 vol, 8vo.; J. L. Porter's *Five Years in Damascus*, 2 vols., 8vo.; Osburn's *Egypt from the Monuments*, 2 vols., 8vo.; Layard's *Nineveh and its Remains*, 2 vols., 8vo.; *The Book and its Mission*, 1 vol., 8vo.; Horne's *Critical Introduction of the Scriptures*, 4 vols., 8vo.; Scripture Manners and Customs, *Christian Knowledge Society*, 1 vol., 12mo.

Appendix.

Appendix.

KURTZ'S HISTORY OF THE OLD COVENANT.

APPEN.

Time of the Exodus.

The author regrets that the work of Dr. Kurtz did not come into his hands in time to make that use of it which he could have wished. He has at the same time the satisfaction of knowing, that any conclusions in which they may coincide, have been arrived at, on his part, by the independent exercise of his own judgment. It is impossible quite to pass over the points on which it might be desirable to consult further the opinions of Dr. Kurtz: 1. *On the Egyptian question, and as regards the Exodus.* Here, as might be imagined, the conclusions in a foregoing chapter are not quite in accord with those of Dr. Kurtz, yet the differences are comparatively immaterial, as the following brief analysis will show. On both hands it is agreed what was the condition and what the ruling dynasty in Egypt at the time of the Exodus. That the arrival of Abraham in Egypt must have fallen in the times, and during the reign, of the Hycsos kings is equally agreed. Where, it appears, we differ is in the time of Joseph's arrival; and here the doctor sides with the most popular view, which is, that Joseph arrived *before* the extinction of the Hycsos dynasty. He, however, quite passes over one of the chief objections to this view, which is the utter silence of Scripture as to any remarkable change of dynasty after Joseph's time, as there must really have been, on the supposition of Joseph having arrived during the reign of

APPEN.

Time of the Exodus.

the Shepherds. We should, however, mention, that the brief remark of Scripture, "another king arose which knew not Joseph," is supposed by Dr. Kurtz to allude to this change. *His* supposition on this head leads him naturally to an *earlier* date of the Exodus; and, accordingly, we find him placing it in the reign of the *third* Amenophis, instead of the Amenophis who was the father of Sethos and son of Raamses; which is simply to ignore the express authority of Manetho as given by Josephus: and so Dr. Kurtz himself allows (vol. ii. p. 411). It is, however, satisfactory to note, that he places the whole event in the seventeenth dynasty, very nearly, at least, about the same period as the reader will find assigned for it, by an entirely independent line of argument, in an earlier part of this work. (See Appendix Chap. II.) The reasons which led him to a Hycsos dynasty for the arrival of Joseph are satisfactory as far as they go; but we should apply them rather to the arrival of Abraham, and, transferred to the time of that patriarch, we think them conclusive. When Joseph rose to power, there would not only have been the prestige of his descent from Abraham, but there was the recommendation of his own superior ability, as shown, in the first instance in the interpretation of the king's dream, and afterward more remarkably still in the skill with which he governed the land as prime minister of Egypt, and found means to avert a terrible calamity by providing corn for the impending famine. Without these *extraordinary* recommendations, which were, indeed, equivalent to a supernatural interposition of Divine Providence, Joseph *never would have been received*, or would at any rate have been kept a prisoner in the dungeon. But taking those miraculous circumstances into account, there is nothing singular in the fact (though it might not have been in a Hycsos reign) of the "Israelitish tribes being made welcome, and the best provinces

Life of Moses.

being allotted to them, and even the gates and keys of the whole country being placed in their hands;"—nothing singular in "Joseph advising his brethren to tell Pharaoh, without hesitation, that they were nomads;"—nor in "the aged patriarch, Jacob, taking upon himself to bless the Egyptian king;"—nor, "when Jacob died, in the whole of the court and the elders of the land of Egypt forming a funeral procession, with chariots and horsemen, in honour of the unclean Shepherd-chief, who was, notwithstanding, an abomination in their eyes." (See vol. iii. pp. 425-6.) 2. *The Life of Moses* is treated throughout with great care; and many interesting disquisitions will be found as to the route of the children of Israel in traversing the wilderness, and all the circumstances of their journey. Still more interesting are the author's remarks on the great objects then in view, of training up the chosen people for the important place they were to occupy in the chain of Providences, which was gradually leading up to the final establishment of Christianity. In particular, the reader should consult the account of the *Brazen Serpent in the Wilderness*, iii. 344—358; the *Institution of the Sabbath* (though here a little German prejudice peeps out), vol. ii. 112, iii. 43, and *ibid.* 313—317 (comparing vol. i. introduction, p. xxi.); the *Route out of Egypt*, ii. 123—129; and the *Wanderings in the Wilderness*, vol. iii. 360—380. 3. *On the Origin of Languages*, and the derivation from one stock of the various races of men, the author has not had the opportunity of consulting Dr. Kurtz. But having himself made it the study of many years, and consulted the best authors, he persuades himself they cannot be very far apart on this branch of the subject. Leaving this, therefore, he hastens on to a brief notice of that which comes last in the order of subjects, as above treated of, but which really yields to none in the interest with which it deserves to be regarded, viz.

APPEN.

Mosaic Order of Creation.

4. *The Acount of the Creation in Gen. I.*, and how far, in all the chief particulars of the Mosaic record, the conclusions of Dr. Kurtz are *in agreement* with those of the foregoing chapters, it shall be left to the reader to decide from the following few extracts: "The Synagogue has rightly characterised even the historical books of the Old Testament as prophetical. But as revelation never supplies what man could have discovered without its aid, we do not find in the historical parts of the Bible (always excepting Gen. i. and ii.) any hint that the writers had received the material of their narratives in a supernatural manner. Hence we conclude that the cooperation of the Holy Spirit consisted in this, that they were enabled to distinguish the true from the spurious in these traditions, and to understand the spiritual bearing of these facts. But beyond the boundaries of human experience lies another development, and hence another history, on the one side embracing the *past*, and on the other the *future*. Only the Lord looks behind and before, beholding both the development which preceded the first appearance of man, and that which lies beyond the present generation. However different, these two histories are similar both as to the ground on which man is unacquainted with them, and the manner in which he may learn to know them. But how is this knowledge imparted? Once only—in Gen. i. to iii.—did God reveal to man what had taken place before his appearance; but very frequently did He communicate events yet future. Now it seems to be a law of revelation, that the disclosure of the future is brought about by prophetic intuition. But as there is no essential difference in principle or otherwise, between a revelation of the future and one of the past, may we not assume that the latter had been communicated in the same manner in which we know the former has invariably been vouchsafed? This supposition is abundantly confirmed

APPEN.

Revelation by prophetic Vision.

by the narrative under consideration. We notice in it a vividness of perception and a pictorialness of description which almost necessarily leads us to conclude that the writer relates what he had seen . . . . We maintain, then, that the narrator was in prophetic illumination, raised to the height of Divine autopsy; that he beheld spiritually what took place before man existed, and then translated into words his vision."—*History of the Old Covenant*, vol. i. introd. p. xix. The reader might compare with this the observations above, at Chap. V. pp. 137, 138.; Chap. VIII. 245—250, and notes. After giving his verdict (p. xxiii.) in favour of the literal sense of the word "day," as used in the account of the creation[1], (observing, moreover, that the account itself appears to furnish the definition, where it says, v. 5, "God divided the light from the darkness; and He called *the*

[1] Dr. Kurtz here gives himself credit for some originality in his definition of "day," or rather in his idea, that each of the "creative days" *began with the morning*, and not with the evening; because (1) work naturally begins with "the light," and (2) because every thing in the sacred text seems to run in sequence of time. Thus God said, "Let there be light! and there was light.—God divided the light from the darkness.—It became evening, it became morning,—and a new day begins." Like many things, which authors think very special, we are unable to see much in the distinction. Where criticism will find real scope in this part of Dr. Kurtz's work will probably be in the very deep and abstruse reasoning with which he supports the opinion, that the desolation of the "*tohu vabohu*" state of the earth described (Gen. i. 2), was connected with the fall of the angels "who kept not their first estate" (Jude 6), and is to be accounted for by the necessity which that fall had occasioned for some fearful visitation on the earth. "This view," he adds, "is very old, though not exactly known to the Fathers, who generally assert that mankind were created to fill the gap left by the fall of the angels, while many of them thought that the race was to increase till the number of the redeemed should equal that of the fallen angels." The idea, however, that chaos was the consequence of the fall of the angels, we do not, as our author candidly acknowledges, find suggested by the Fathers.—See Kurtz, *Introduction*, p. lv.—lx.

APPEN.

The Six Creative days.

light 'day,' and the darkness He called night,") he explains the Scripture narrative on a principle, of which the following is a kind of summary at p. lxvii. :—" We have already seen that the work of the six creative days had nothing to do with the creation of the earth, far less with that of the universe. Before it commenced, heaven and earth already existed, although the latter at least was as yet without light and life, '*tohu vabohu.*' Our globe received its living organisms during the six creative days, and that in ascending scale. Earth gradually assumed its present form, displayed its physical forces, received its inhabitants, and assumed its peculiar relation to the other heavenly bodies. Neither astronomy nor geology can hazard an opinion about the period requisite for such purposes. Astronomy may be right in maintaining that the fixed stars must have been in existence for hundreds of thousands of years. But it cannot possibly assert that sun, moon, and stars had regulated our earthly night and day prior to the fourth creative day. In order that their light might affect our earth, it was necessary not only that *they* should have light, but also that the earth should be susceptible of light, and astronomy can never dispute that this adaptation had taken place at the period fixed by the Bible. Similarly we may admit, so far as geology is concerned, that immense periods had preceded the present formation of the earth. These either occurred before or during the 'tohu vabohu.' Against such suppositions there is nothing in the Bible. But no geologist could ever convince us that the last preparation of the surface of the earth had required either more or less than six days. If any doubt could obtain on this point, it would rather be why the Omnipotent had not given to this earth in a moment its present form? But the Fathers have already returned a satisfactory reply to this objection. As the earth itself was designed for man, so the duration and distribution of God's creative agency bore

APPEN.

Real purport of the Narrative.

special reference to man. God's work upon earth was to be a type of the future activity of man. A second objection to the Scripture narrative is derived from the supposed unequal distribution of the creative work over the six days. This objection specially applies to the fourth day's work. While five whole days, it is said, were spent upon our poor earth, which is but a dot in the universe, all the other millions or perhaps billions of suns and worlds were finished in one day. But evidently this objection proceeds on the same misunderstanding as that which we have already refuted. If, in accordance with the real purport of the narrative, we understand that on the fourth day only the permanent relation between the earth and the stars was fixed, all the difficulties conjured up immediately vanish." Again:—"The organisms of the primeval world are not the animals and plants of the Mosaic cosmogony, but neither are they those of historical times, while the organisms of the Biblical narrative are those with which natural history presently makes us acquainted. Thus the supposed contradiction is removed. The types buried in the rocks were not destined to continue perpetually, or else have not attained their destination: they were not created for *man*, and have not been his contemporaries on earth. Long before he appeared they had become extinct, and were shut up in their rocky graves. Only after the lapse of six thousand years has man beheld their bones, and they now present an enigma which natural science will probably never solve, as if to convince us of the inadequacy of our powers at the very period when science pretends to be able to explain everything. Beyond doubt, *the fossils of the rocks cannot represent those organisations whose creation the Bible relates.* It speaks not of the Entozoa of geology; refers only to those beings which were created *for man*, partly for his nourishment, and partly as

APPEN.

Objections to the Biblico-geological theory.

means of, and aids to, his own peculiar activity. On the other hand, geology does not treat of *those* creatures, which, according to the Scriptures, were called forth on the third, fifth, and sixth days, nor can this science take notice of them, since their types were intended to continue and not to perish, and their families were not to be petrified in strata, but each individual was to decay in the ordinary manner, so that their bones have mostly passed away without leaving any trace" (p. cxxiii.). Lastly, Dr. Kurtz supports his general line of argument by the following principal considerations, in which he enumerates the principal reasons which decided him for the anti-geological interpretation (so to speak) of "the days;"—"We assert as strenuously as the other side, that an impartial comparison of the results of geology with the statements of Holy Writ, rightly understood, will prove that the two harmonise. But we cannot for that purpose adopt any method which could either do violence to the plain language of Scripture, or to the well-established conclusions of geology. But the common mode of harmonising errs in both respects. For (1.) It is evident that Scripture describes the creative days as natural and ordinary days (having 'evening and morning,' 'light and darkness'); while in order to identify the geological with the Biblical creation, it is necessary to represent them as periods of 'Divine duration,' each comprising thousands, nay, perhaps 'millions of terrestrial years.' (2.) It is evident that we read only of *one* general inundation within the six creative days (Gen. i. 2—10), to which, on the third day, bounds were assigned which were not to be passed till the flood. But the above theory requires that we should suppose that a number of inundations had taken place in order to account for the numerous secondary and tertiary stratifications which are thought to have taken place on the fifth and sixth days. (3.) Scripture plainly states that the mountains

APPEN.

Objections to the Biblico-geological theory.

of the earth existed *at any rate* on the *third* day. (See Ps. civ. 8.) But this theory requires us to believe that the secondary and tertiary (if not the primary) strata and rocks had been formed on the fifth and sixth days. (4.) Scripture plainly states, that plants *only*, and not animals of any kind, were created on the third day, and animals *only*, but not trees and plants, on the fifth and sixth days. But according to this theory, these Biblical are the same as the geological periods of which each has *both* its plants and animals. (5.) It is evident that the Hexaemeron only speaks of three periods of organic creation, while geology counts as many as there are stratifications. Yet the above theory identifies the Biblical with the geological creations. (6.) Lastly, it is evident, on the one hand, that the flora and fauna of the primeval world had perished *before* man appeared, and hence could not have been destined to continue along with man on the earth; and, on the other hand, that according to the clear and unequivocal statements of Scripture, the flora and fauna created during the six days were created *for* man, and destined to continue on earth along with him. Yet the above theory confounds those two kinds of flora and fauna."—*Introduction*, pp. cxxix. cxxx.

These are somewhat dry and verbal criticisms; but the admirable spirit which pervades the writings of Dr. Kurtz will appear from the following extract, with which we conclude:—"Our earth, compared with the other planets, has distinguishing features, which, however, are yet undeveloped germs concealed in the forms of lowliness and distorted through the curse of sin. We anticipate that these features will at last fully appear. We expect that in those times what at present appear as hostile contrasts shall combine and cooperate;—that sin and death, and with them all their shadows and fruits, shall have passed away, and that the members of our solar system which at present are

APPEN.

The future harmony of Creation.

isolated, shall be united by bonds of harmony, communion, sympathy, and love. Perhaps this will be realised in a manner analogous to what we witness in the heavens; perhaps those worlds, which although now separated are so closely related, shall move in sacred harmony, perhaps they shall stand in immediate communion with one another; perhaps the sea of ether belonging to our system, which at present is unillumined, shall be pervaded with light and afford an 'eternal sunshine,' uniting worlds as now it separates them, just as the luminous atmosphere of the heavens of the fixed stars binds together the worlds that move in it.

"But the distinguishing excellency of our earth will consist in this, that ransomed and glorified man, created in, and restored to the image of God, shall dwell there, and that here the Lord of Glory, who to all eternity has taken upon Himself their nature, shall make His abode among those whom He is not 'ashamed to call brethren;'—that He shall bring with Him upon earth that unfading inheritance of His Sonship, of which they are to be fellow-heirs; that He shall establish among them the throne of His grace and power, of His glory and Majesty; —and that He himself, the Uncreated Light, shall shine upon them with a brilliancy which no creature has yet beheld. But as to the conditions and changes which all this implies in the *physical* condition of the earth and of our system, and in their *cosmical* relation to the rest of the universe, it becomes us in silence to await the arrangements which the great Creator shall make. Our earth is unique in its present state of humiliation; it will be unique in its future exaltation. As man is made lower than the angels, and yet is the 'embryo of the highest of all creatures,' so our earth also is made lower than the celestial worlds, and yet is the 'noblest germ in creation.' As Judæa was the least and most

APPEN.

The glorious destiny of the Earth.

despised country of the earth, and yet the 'glorious land' (Dan. xi. 16, 41); as Bethlehem was least among the thousands of Israel (Mic. v. 2), and yet the Sun of Righteousness arose there (Matt. iv. 2); so our solar system is the Judæa of the universe, and our insignificant earth the Bethlehem of this Holy Land — poor and despised, yet precious above all. As in that prophetic dream, sun, moon, and stars bent in lowly obeisance before Joseph, who yet was the least among his brethren, so shall they also make obeisance to our earth, although it is one of the smallest worlds in the universe. When at first Jehovah founded the earth, the morning-stars looked on with songs of praise; when the Eternal Word, full of grace and truth, left the throne of glory to clothe Himself with our nature, the hosts of heaven burst forth into this hymn, '*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men.*' When again the Son of man shall return in the clouds, surrounded with all the glory of His eternal Godhead, to renew heaven and earth, and to consummate all things, shall those messengers of his power and goodness, in whose presence even now there is joy at every new progress of the kingdom of God upon earth (Luke xv. 7), behold with rapturous delight the unfolding of that 'mystery of godliness,' into which they now 'desire to look;' and in louder tones and loftier strains shall then enchoir their never-ending Hallelujah (Rev. v. 12, 13)."—Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant Introd.* pp. cii. ciii. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1859.

THE END.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE.

ENGLISH EDITION OF FRANCOIS ARAGO'S WORKS.

Now complete, in 2 vols. 8vo. illustrated with a Series of 25 Plates and 358 Woodcuts, price 45s. cloth,

POPULAR ASTRONOMY

By FRANCOIS ARAGO, Member of the Institute.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL AND EDITED BY

Admiral W. H. SMYTH, D.C.L., For. Sec. R.S., and ROBERT GRANT, M.A.

The Two Volumes may be had separately :—

Vol. I. with 19 Plates and 226 Woodcuts and Diagrams ...8vo. price 21s.
Vol. II. with 6 Plates and 132 Woodcuts and Diagrams ...8vo. price 24s.

Critical Opinions *of the* Second Volume.

"FROM the finished and accurate manner in which the translation is effected, reflecting the highest credit upon the editors, the position of this work, as an authentic reflex of one of the greatest modern philosophers, will be indisputably and justly pre-eminent." JOHN BULL.

"THIS excellent edition and translation of Arago's *Popular Astronomy* is now complete; and the two volumes form a treatise very interesting by reason of the multitude of its details, which are all well classified, sufficiently illustrated, and indexed. The English work is an edition as well as a translation, and among the duties imposed on its editors was that of supplying the occasional defect in the French astronomer's recognition of the claims of English science, especially conspicuous in the treatment of Mr. Adams, English joint-discoverer with M. Le Verrier of the Planet *Neptune*. Upon M. Arago's genius as an Astronomer we need not dwell. His book of Astronomy will take its proper place among standard authorities on English shelves." EXAMINER.

"THIS volume completes the English version of M. Arago's *Popular Astronomy*. It contains no less than 848 pages, although the editors, with sound judgment, have omitted certain passages which, however interesting to French readers as relating to matters peculiarly appertaining to France, have no effect on the completeness of the work as a treatise on astronomy. They have retained much that can scarcely be considered as coming within the province of astronomy; but in those instances they have been influenced by the interest to an inquiring mind of the subjects, and the lucid manner in which the author has discussed them. In order to adapt the work to the present state of astronomy, the editors have in an appendix continued the catalogue of cometary orbits, so as to embody all the most recent discoveries; including a statement of the principal facts relating to the comet discovered by Dr. Donati on the 2d of June, 1858. They have also abridged the chapters devoted to the minor planets, and thereby increased the value of the volume." MORNING POST.

"THE work itself, in its English form, is to be recommended, and strongly recommended, to the popular reader.....The book has Arago's admirable perspicuity from beginning to end.....The reader will find a mass of amusing matter, provided only that he takes an interest in the subject: the lecturer will find a mine of suggestions which, with proper caution, may enable him to diversify and enliven his matter. For it is one of the best characteristics of the work, that nothing of physics which can be drawn into the subject is left out of it." ATHENÆUM.

"THE second volume of this magnificent work is now before the public, and brings the author's exposition of popular astronomy to its close. Some of the subjects treated in this work are not usually considered as coming within the province of astronomy but the translators deem them so interesting to every inquiring mind, and they are discussed so lucidly by the author, that they are preserved in the translation. In order to adapt the book as much as possible to the present state of astronomy, the editors have, in the appendix, continued the catalogue of cometary orbits down to the most recent time, so as to embody all the latest discoveries, including the facts relating to Donati's comet. The numerical results are in the translation expressed in English measures; and the results of the centigrade thermometer are accompanied by the corresponding numbers expressed in terms of the Fahrenheit scale. The illustrations of this volume are splendid. The frontispiece, a view of Saturn, is a work that does honour to the engraver: we have rarely seen anything more exquisite in this style of art. The plates of solar eclipses are scarcely less beautiful. There is an abundance of woodcuts; and in every respect this improved English edition of an important work is highly creditable to the editors and publishers. There are few works on astronomy that can stand comparison with this. Arago wrote in a very clear style; and all his clearness of expression is preserved in the translation; while the notes added by the English editors are well calculated to prevent those less skilled in the science from falling into errors. The author's reputation as an astronomer is world-wide, but he was not infallible in the science of which he was a professor. Some of his views were undoubtedly erroneous; and his work is improved by the editorial labours of Admiral Smyth and Mr. Grant." MORNING HERALD.

In the same Series, uniformly printed,

ARAGO'S BIOGRAPHIES OF DISTINGUISHED SCIENTIFIC MEN.

Translated by Admiral W. H. SMYTH, D.C.L., For. Sec. R.S.; the Rev. BADEN POWELL, M.A.; and ROBERT GRANT, M.A. .....8vo. price 18s.

1. ARAGO'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY
2. BAILLY;
3. HERSCHEL;
4. LAPLACE;
5. JOSEPH FOURIER;
6. CARNOT
7. MALUS;
8. FRESNEL;
9. THOMAS YOUNG;
10. JAMES WATT (with *Note* by W. FAIRBAIRN, F.R.S.)

ARAGO'S METEOROLOGICAL ESSAYS.

With an Introduction by Baron HUMBOLDT. Translated under the Superintendence of Major-General E. SABINE, R.A., Treasurer and V.P.R.S.....8vo. price 18s.

1. THUNDER AND LIGHTNING;
2. FIRES OF ST. ELMO;
3. GEOGRAPHY OF STORMS;
4. ELECTRO-MAGNETISM;
5. ANIMAL ELECTRICITY;
6. TERRESTRIAL MAGNETISM;
7. AURORA BOREALIS.

London: LONGMAN, BROWN, and CO., Paternoster Row.

BOUND BY EDMONDS&REMNANTS LONDON